

REVIEW
OF
SEYMOUR'S TRACT.
HIS FIFTY QUESTIONS
ANSWERED.

BY J. M. ALDRICH.



STEAM PRESS
OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION,
BATTLE CREEK. MICH.

1862.

Private Library

OF

W. H. EDWARDS.

REVIEW

OF

SEYMOUR'S TRACT.

HIS FIFTY QUESTIONS

ANSWERED.

BY J. M. ALDRICH.

STEAM PRESS

OF THE SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST PUBLISHING ASSOCIATION,
BATTLE CREEK, MICH.

1862.

JAMES WHITE LIBRARY
ANDREWS UNIVERSITY
BERRIEN SPRINGS, MICHIGAN

Vault

BV

125

S48A52

HER

306616

PREFACE.

IN the following pages the reviewer has given Eld. Seymour's entire tract, word for word, with a reply in style well suited to the job on hand.

Eld. S. is a no-Sabbath Adventist minister. His reviewer is a lay member of the Seventh-day Adventists.

The editor of the *Millennial Harbinger* advertises Eld. S.'s tract thus:

"This tract sets forth some *strong* and *powerful* arguments against keeping the Mosaic law in this age, and is just the tract to put into the hands of those in danger of being entrapped by this Sabbath-keeping delusion."

Eld. H. Munger, a no-Sabbath Adventist minister in New England, in the *Harbinger* of May 21, 1862, says:

"I have just read Bro. Seymour's "Unanswerable Arguments" on the Sabbath question, and find it sound, pithy, and short. If any one has got the head-swim on this subject, read this little tract, follow out the references, and I think his head and heart will be regulated."

This editor calls the tract "strong," "powerful," "just the tract," and this minister recommends it as

the grand panacea, the all-healing medicine for both head and heart. As these men seem to stake their faith upon Eld. S.'s tract, they will of course share with him the glory he reaps for asking fifty simple questions. The veriest novice can make quite a display in opposing any plainly revealed truth by asking questions. The reader may get the impression that the reviewer has wasted ammunition on small game, yet as these questions of Eld. S., by being endorsed by others, seemed to be attracting some attention, we are happy to see this commendable response by Bro. A.

J. W.

REVIEW OF SEYMOUR.

A. N. SEYMOUR'S "Fifty Unanswerable Arguments against Seventh-day Sabbath-keeping" are before me. "Arguments!" did I say? I said so; for such is the term that adorns the title-page of his tract! Let the quotation-marks, however, give due credit to the author. What dictionary may have suggested to his mind the use of such a term, I will not undertake to determine. Did I believe in the ghosts of departed men, I would say, Let the shade of Noah Webster rest upon him!

But these so-called "arguments" are said to be "unanswerable." Shall I then be so presumptuous as to undertake to answer them? Indeed, the thought of attempting to answer "fifty unanswerable arguments" is almost overwhelming! But, kind reader, be patient. There is no occasion yet for becoming wholly speechless. A word yet may be offered.

But as I shall not presume to answer "unanswerable arguments," I feel bound to give the author credit for more self-conceit than ability to produce arguments that cannot be answered.

That he has a remarkable gift, however, for asking questions, none will deny; and with such a faculty it is almost a wonder that another "fifty" were not added to his catalogue. But that his questions amount to arguments will not be so readily conceded. And though his questions are utterly barren of testimony in his

behalf, yet it would not be strange if, in the free exercise of the wonderful gift he seems to possess, some questions might be asked that would puzzle even a genius to answer. So, perhaps, in regard to many of the questions that follow, it may be quite difficult to produce answers that will be satisfactory to the mind of the cavalier; not, however, from any intrinsic soundness in themselves; far from it; but rather from their peculiar nature—their technical evasion of the real question in issue—their remoteness from the subject, or entire want of bearing thereon.

It has been truly said by an eminent writer that “pertness and ignorance may ask a question in three lines which will cost learning and ingenuity thirty pages to answer.” It is very strongly in this light that I regard the “fifty” questions which I now propose to consider. If therefore in my narrow limits I fail to answer them all in a manner satisfactory to those who are disposed to doubt and cavil, I shall not be disappointed; but I trust I may be able to show to every candid mind that whatever may be contained or implied therein, they do not involve any arguments or objections against the observance of the Lord’s Sabbath; viz., the *seventh day*. I will first submit his preliminary remarks:

“My only object in presenting the following arguments touching the Sabbath question, is truth, righteousness, the glory of God, and the salvation of man from error to truth, confidently believing that no person can overthrow the positions taken; and whoever shall thoroughly digest or comprehend the arguments presented, will never embrace that theory; or, if a believer, will most certainly renounce it. *Truth* is from God, *error* is from man. Then let us with the sword of truth, which is the word of God, at once strike a death-blow to seventh-day Sabbath-keeping. O God,

in the all-prevailing name of Jesus Christ, thy well-beloved Son, and by the Spirit’s power, stamp indelibly the *truth* upon every honest soul that this communication shall reach, is my most fervent prayer.

“Gal. i. 8. ‘But though we (the apostles), or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached, let him be accursed.’ Whatever the apostles preached, they preached by the revelation of Jesus Christ: and where is the man who dares be presumptuous enough to deny that Jesus Christ and the twelve apostles did not preach the *whole counsel* of God concerning this dispensation, that was not fully ordained and qualified to discharge the various obligations imposed upon them by him whose all-piercing eye penetrates every dark cell of the human heart.

“Every sensible man, every student of the Bible, must heartily acknowledge that this subject cannot be adjusted only as it is brought to the scrutinizing *test* of the teachings of Christ and his holy apostles. To ignore the New Testament Scriptures on this theme, is to preach another gospel—to quench the Holy Spirit, and to render ourselves ‘vessels of wrath fitted for destruction.’ O God, help us to be wise, and seek for that wisdom and righteousness which flows from *thee*, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and not through Moses or the law.

“In order to more clearly and forcibly impress the candid and thoughtful reader, I shall go back to creation and commence asking some plain and direct questions on the subject now brought forward for investigation, and continue down through, closing up with the New Testament Scriptures, and make explanations as I shall deem necessary.”

The author’s “object,” as stated, is truly laudable and praiseworthy, and well becoming his profession as a minister of the gospel; and it were indeed a pity that he had not pursued the same accordingly throughout his work, rather than betray therein such a malign-

nant spirit toward the Lord's Sabbath, and those who are trying to observe it according to the commandment.

"With the sword of truth" he means to "strike a death-blow to seventh-day Sabbath-keeping." Your weapon, friend Seymour, is a good one, but it needs to be carefully used; for it is a "two-edged sword," and will cut both ways, and possibly after all, you may receive the greater wound. But hold! one moment, friend S., before you "strike" what you intend as a "death-blow" to the Sabbath. Be merciful! Will you not make us acquainted with the *guilt* of your victim before you crimson your "sword?" Let us know, then, in the plenitude of your forbearance, what there is about "seventh-day Sabbath-keeping" so wicked, so vile, or so obnoxious, as to make it incumbent on you to unsheath the sword to strike the same a "death-blow." Is it not, to say the least, a wholesome and inoffensive practice? You will concede that one day in seven is none too much to be set apart for the proper observance of such religious duties as God requires of his children. (You in fact once acknowledged as much by trying to prove that "the first day of the week" was the "*Sabbath of this dispensation*." See article published in the *World's Crisis* over your signature about a year and a half ago.) It is also a conceded fact that one day in seven is none too much for needful relaxation from the physical labor and toil that is becoming and necessary for man to pursue. If then we find the observance of one day in seven absolutely necessary, both for our temporal and spiritual good, why not observe the *seventh day* as well as the *first day*, or any other? And if perchance we can glean, or even think we can glean, some little authority from the word of

God for the observance of the seventh day, can you not in mercy spare us? Can you not forbear? Can you not sheath again your "sword," and so after all conclude that you are engaged in at least a *useless* task?

But no, the troubled waters cannot be so easily quieted! Those pent-up feelings must have vent! Then all I can say is, "Strike!" But let me caution you again to be careful how you handle the "sword of truth;" for it is a dangerous weapon in the hands of those not accustomed to using it.

It is asked, "Where is the man who dares be presumptuous enough to deny that Jesus Christ and the twelve apostles did not preach the *whole counsel* of God in this dispensation?" I answer, A. N. Seymour. Why? Because he denies that Christ and the apostles preached the perpetuity of God's law, or ten commandments; whereas, Christ and the apostles did preach as part of the "whole counsel of God," the perpetuity of his law; that it was not abolished; that one tittle thereof should not fail; that whoever offended in one point was guilty of all, &c. Matt. v, 17, 18; Luke xvi, 17; Rom. iii, 31; vii, 7; James ii, 8-12. Therefore in offending against the fourth precept of God's law, both by preaching and practice, A. N. Seymour "becomes a transgressor of the law," and also guilty of preaching "another gospel."

I will now submit his so-called "arguments" as per his arrangement, and make such remarks as I may deem proper; and should I to some extent adopt his peculiar mode of argument, it will be that he may better appreciate the same, or at least see what force or logic there is in his method of reasoning.

"The Scriptures of truth teach us that God by his

Son created all things in six days, and that he blessed and sanctified the seventh day, because that in it *he* had rested from all his works which he had created and made. Gen. ii, 3.

"1. Where is there the least proof in the above language that obligates Adam, or any of his posterity, to do as God did, viz., rest on the seventh day?"

It matters not whether the "proof" exists wholly in the text quoted, or elsewhere in the Bible, so long as "truth, righteousness, and the glory of God," is the main "object" in view. The Bible, upon this point, as well as upon others of any importance, is cumulative. And though we do not find the express command in Gen. ii, 3, to "rest on the seventh day," we do find such a command elsewhere in the word of God. The book of Genesis is not a book of commands; but rather a brief history of events, inspired and written many years subsequent to the time of Adam and the patriarchs; hence there existed no necessity for incorporating into such history the commandments of God that were in force during the patriarchal age. Therefore we can easily see why Gen. ii, 3, does not in positive terms enforce the Sabbath obligation. However, as an answer to the question, it is enough to say that the text affords plain inferential proof that Adam and his posterity were required to rest on the seventh day. God *sanctified* his rest-day; viz., the seventh; i. e., set it apart for a holy and religious use. If therefore the seventh day was thus set apart for religious use at the end of the first week of time, who should use it thus except Adam and his posterity?

"2. Where is there *one command* from God, the supreme Law-giver, to keep holy the seventh-day Sabbath from *creation* to the *exode* of the children of Israel from Egyptian bondage?"

Where is there "one command" from God during the time named, requiring man to have no other gods than him, or not to profane the name of God, or not to steal, &c.? We find no such "command" incorporated into the brief record of that long period of time; but who will therefore suppose that God had no such commands during all that time? or that those "holy men of old" lived in the habitual practice of idolatry, profanity, theft, &c.? No one will suppose any such thing. But if they were obedient unto all the rest of the ten precepts, why doubt their obedience unto the *fourth* also? Surely this is not an "unanswerable argument," unless it be from the fact that it contains nothing to answer.

"3. During the 2500 years from creation to the exode, where is there any *example* of any one's observing it?"

Suppose we cannot give an "example;" would that constitute an "unanswerable argument?" But we do find even in the brief history of the said 2500 years, that it is said of Abraham that he "kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws." But, Eld. S. will say, nothing is said about his keeping the Sabbath. True, but we find here that God had commandments and laws during that period, and we have given an "example" of one's keeping them all; and we learn in Ex. xvi that a part of God's law pertained to the observance of the Sabbath; not, however, as some claim, as a precept incorporated therein in the wilderness of Sin, but as a commandment previously existing. Friend S., put on your spectacles and read that chapter once more!

"4. Where is there any *rebuke* for violating any such precept during the same length of time?"

Where is there any "rebuke" during that time for violating the *third* precept, which forbids profanity? There is none recorded; hence, according to Eld. S., I have an "unanswerable argument" in favor of a doctrine that allowed "holy men of old" to profane the name of the Lord. How logical!

"5. Where is the *sin* of Sabbath-breaking mentioned from Adam to Moses?"

Where is the "sin" of covetousness or false-swearing mentioned during that time? Why, friend S., how easy it is to produce "unanswerable arguments!" What remarkably free times those patriarchs and "holy men of old" must have enjoyed before the "exode!"

"6. What, and where, is the *penalty* for violating any such commandment prior to the exode?"

The "penalty" for violating God's law before the "exode" is the same as for violating it afterward; viz., *death*! "Sin is the transgression of the law," whether before or after the "exode," and "the wages of sin is death." 1 John iii, 4; Rom. vi, 23. But if Eld. S. can better comprehend his style of argument, I will ask him, What, and where, is the penalty for idolatry "prior to the exode?"

"7. Where is there *one command* of God to any of the Gentile nations, either in this or any preceding dispensation, to observe the seventh-day Sabbath? Eph. ii, 11, 12; Rom. ii, 14."

I answer, the "command" is recorded in Ex. xx, 8-11. It was spoken from mount Sinai with God's own voice, was written with his own finger on tables of stone, and was part of the moral rule of his universe, whether composed of Jews or Gentiles. But again, Christ says, "The Sabbath was made for man." Mark

ii, 27. Does not the term "man" embrace the Gentiles, as well as the Jews? If not, then it must relate exclusively to the *man Adam*, who was the *only* man on earth when the Sabbath was made; for there is no evidence whatever, that the term "man" embraces one portion of the human race, to the exclusion of another. But Adam is the federal head of the whole human family; therefore, if the Sabbath was made for Adam, all nations, whether Jew or Gentile, may claim its blessings through him.

But doubtless friend S. will not appreciate this kind of argument; I will therefore resort to his more conclusive mode, and ask him, where, except in Ex. xx, there is "one command of God"—as part of a new or original law, to any of the Gentile nations, requiring them to keep *any* of the precepts contained in the ten commandments? Will friend S. produce the law? What bearing Eph. ii, 11, 12; and Rom. ii, 14, have upon the *question*, is more than I can discern.

"8. Where have we any *example* of Gentile nations' observing it according to the commandment delivered to Israel at, or after, the exode? Neh. ix, 12-14."

The text referred to, Neh. ix, 12-14, as the voucher for another "unanswerable argument" is part of a rehearsal of God's goodness manifested unto the children of Israel; wherein is stated the fact that God came down upon Mount Sinai and gave them "right judgments and true laws, good statutes and commandments and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath," &c. This text is certainly very remote from the *question* asked; but is doubtless introduced as proof that the Sabbath was not given till "at, or after the exode." How will friend S. have it? "*At, or after?*" In either case it comes far short of proving what he designs

it to prove; for the language—"Madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath"—not, madest *for* them thy holy Sabbath—clearly implies that it had a *previous* existence. But the text plainly refers to the giving of the commandment from mount Sinai, though in Ex. xvi, we learn that the Sabbath *was* "known" unto Israel thirty days before they came to Sinai; therefore, the text reaches a little too far to suit our friend's present position. How unfortunate for him that inspiration ever penned the 16th chapter of Exodus!

The "question" however calls for an "example of Gentile nations' observing the Sabbath according to the commandment." But as the question is offered as one of the "unanswerable arguments against seventh-day Sabbath-keeping" in the present dispensation, or at the present time, I will therefore ask, Is not the "example" of Christ, his apostles and disciples, better for us than the example of Gentile nations? Which shall we follow? As a sufficient "example" for us, on the point in question I will only name that of those holy women that came with our Lord "from Galilee," and followed him to the very last, "through evil as well as good report," who "beheld the sepulcher and how his body was laid," and when "the Sabbath drew on . . . returned and prepared spices and ointments; and *rested the Sabbath-day according to the commandment.*" Luke xxiii, 56.

"9. Where is the *rebuke* to any of these nations for violating the Sabbath commandment?"

Again inquiry is made for a "*rebuke*" for violating the Sabbath. Is it not because his own conscience *rebukes* him, that he is so solicitous on this point? Why, sir, the fact that God, the maker of heaven and earth

condescended to make the Sabbath for man, instead of man for the Sabbath; and also the fact that the Son of man is Lord of the Sabbath, is a standing "*rebuke*" to any man or nation who refuses or neglects to observe it.

"10. Where is the *sin* of Sabbath breaking mentioned in connection with the Gentile nations?"

"Unanswerable argument!" What if the *sin* of Sabbath breaking is *not* mentioned in connection with the Gentiles; would that therefore make sin, not sin! Strange conclusion! But may not some things be *implied* as well as *expressed*? In Isaiah lvi, 6, we find a reward promised to Gentiles that shall keep the Sabbath. Is it not then clearly implied that Gentiles who do *not* keep the Sabbath, commit sin? So it seems to me.

"11. What, and where is the *penalty* or *punishment* due to these nations for violating such a requirement?"

Death! See reply to "unanswerable argument," No. 6.

"12. Where is the *evidence* that God enjoined the *same laws* upon Gentile nations, that he did upon the Jewish nation at the exode?"

David says God's law is the *truth*, also that his commandments are *sure*; they stand fast forever and ever, and are done in *truth* and *uprightness*. Ps. cxi, 7, 8, cxix, 142. Was such a law, and such commandments binding upon Jews, and not upon Gentiles? Who can believe it? Again, Paul says, "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and *all the world* may become guilty before God." Rom. iii, 19. Here then is "*evidence*" of a law that is universal in

its character, embracing within its jurisdiction, "all the world," whether Jews or Gentiles. It is also a law by which *guilt* is made known, or by which is the "knowledge of sin." But Paul says, Rom. vii, 7, "Nay, I had not known sin but by the law, for I had not known lust except the law had said 'thou shalt not covet,'" Here then we have *identified* the law that says "Thou shalt not covet," viz, the ten commandments, as the law by which guilt or sin is made known, and which embraces in its jurisdiction "all the world." Therefore, so far as this law is concerned, "God enjoined upon the Gentile nations" the same that he did upon the Jews.

"13. Where is there any *evidence* that God enjoined the *covenant* of ten commandments upon Israel prior to the exode? Deut. iv, 13, and v, 3."

Did God have a *moral government* during the nearly 2,500 years prior to the exode! during which time Enoch walked with God, when Noah was a preacher of righteousness, and when Abraham kept God's commandments, his statutes and his laws? All say, Yes. Then surely he must have had a *moral rule or code* as the standard of such government. Now I challenge Eld. S. or any one else to invent or name a moral code *not* embracing the precepts of the ten commandments. It cannot be done. Therefore the ten commandments *must* have been enjoined on Israel, as also, upon the nations that preceded him—"prior to the exode."

Again we learn that *sin* prevailed during that period. Gen. iv, 7; xiii, 13; xviii, 20, &c. But the only Bible definition of sin is "the transgression of the law." And James informs us, chap. ii, 9-11, by a clear reference to the code of ten commandments, that those who violate them, "become transgressors of the

law," and thereby "commit sin." Therefore, how shall we evade the conclusion, that the ten commandments were in force "prior to the exode," and that the violation thereof, constituted the sin of that age? But under this head reference is made to Deut. iv, 13, and v, 3, for what purpose I know not, unless it be to prove that the "covenant of ten commandments" was not binding until spoken from Sinai. But let it be borne in mind that there are *two* covenants brought to view in the two texts quoted; the former refers to the ten commandments alone, the latter refers to that covenant that was not made "with our fathers," but "with us in Horeb," which was the mutual agreement between God and Israel. Ex. xix, the ten commandments being the moral conditions or basis thereof. But let us not lose sight of the real question under discussion; viz., the Sabbath. If, therefore, friend S. be right in claiming that Deut. v, 3, refers to the ten commandments as the covenant not made with the fathers, it follows that they were not only exonerated from regarding the seventh day as the Sabbath, but were also released from the observance of the other nine commandments! So Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were permitted to have other gods—to bow down to idols—to profane the name of the Lord, to steal, kill, bear false witness, &c! Does not this prove a little too much! But here comes the 16th of Ex. again, which informs us that God's commandments and laws, embracing the *Sabbath* were in force thirty days before Israel came to Horeb where this covenant was made, and where the ten commandments were formally declared. Proof: "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the Lord hath given you the

Sabbath." Therefore, the texts quoted are of no avail to the objector.

"14. Where is there any *evidence* that God enjoins this *same covenant* upon Gentile nations?"

(See reply to No. 12.) Paul, who was an apostle to the Gentiles, taught the perpetuity of this "same covenant," and also that he who was God of the Jews, is also God of the Gentiles. Rom. iii, 29-31. And doubtless Paul designed and taught, that the same law that convinced him of sin, Rom. vii, 7, should be instrumental in the conversion of the Gentiles; otherwise, he would be guilty of preaching "another gospel." Gal. i, 8.

"15. Where is the *proof* that God gave to Israel any more than *one law* or *institution*, or *constitution*, or *plan* of salvation, as a *rule* of duty during the Jewish dispensation?"

I know of but *one* "plan of salvation," either in the Jewish dispensation, or any other dispensation; viz., Obedience to God's law and faith in Jesus Christ. There may be different methods of manifesting faith, but the grand scheme of salvation is *one*. In the former dispensation faith was manifested through types, offerings and ceremonies, that pointed *forward* to Christ; in the latter, or present, dispensation, faith is manifested through types and ceremonies that point *back* to Christ. But was there more than one "law" given to Israel? I answer, Yes: The *moral* and the *ceremonial*; the one growing out of the relations we sustain to God and our fellow men, which is founded in "truth and uprightness," and binding upon all men through all ages unto the end of time, which was written with the finger of God on tables of stone, and of

which it is said, "He added no more." Deut. v. 22. Here then is *one* law complete in itself, pure and undiluted—secure in the ark of God. The other, or ceremonial, was temporary in its nature, not founded on fundamental principles, but growing out of the lamentable fact that man had transgressed the former, had sinned, and therefore stood in need of redemption; hence a system of types and shadows through which he might manifest his faith in the great remedy provided, and thus obtain the accomplishment of God's design in giving his son to die. Here then we find another law separate and distinct from the former. Nothing seems clearer than this. The fact that we find one system or law shadowing forth a redemption, proves the existence of sin; hence the transgression of *another* and *prior* law, for "sin is the transgression of the law."

"16. Where is the least *proof* that the expressions, 'The law of God, the law of Moses, the book of the law of God, and the book of the law of Moses,' does not signify precisely the same thing? Neh. viii, 1, 8, 14, 18. Luke ii, 22-24. 1 Kings ii, 3. Mal. iv, 4."

Admit that the foregoing expressions are frequently used interchangeably, and signify precisely the same thing, would that constitute an unanswerable argument against seventh-day Sabbath-keeping? I think not! If friend S. designs the foregoing as an argument against the Sabbath, he should in some way indicate or suggest what bearing the same has upon the subject. Suffice it to say that the *ten commandments* and the *law of Moses* do not "signify precisely the same thing." Compare Matt. v, 17-19, with Acts xv, 5, 24.

"17. Where is there *one jot* or *tittle* of *testimony* in all the book of God, stating that the *ten commandments alone*, constitutes God's moral, holy, or spiritual law, by which the world is to be saved or condemned?"

"One jot or tittle of testimony" is all that is asked for. I will give that amount cheerfully. Paul, in speaking of the law that says "Thou shalt not covet," Rom. vii, says, verse 12, "*the law is holy*," also verse 14, "*the law is spiritual*;" and James, chap. ii, in speaking of the same law, or the law which forbids murder and adultery, informs us that man is to be *judged* by it; therefore, according to Paul and James, the law of ten commandments is "holy" and "spiritual," and is the rule of judgment, "by which the world is to be saved or condemned." Does not this "jot or tittle of testimony" answer the specifications above named? If not, will Eld. S. give us the additional testimony, and inform us what must be superadded to the ten commandments?

"18. Where is the *proof* that the *ten commandments alone*, are a perfect *law* or *rule* of action to any people in any dispensation? Proof to the contrary, James ii, 10. Gal. v, 1-4. Matt. xxviii, 20. Acts ii, 38. 2 Pet. i, 4-7. Acts xvi, 30, 31. Rom. x, 6-10."

God spake the ten commandments with his own voice, and wrote them with his own finger on tables of stone, and "added no more." Was the law thus spoken and written, imperfect? God forbid! If incomplete, how happens it that God "added no more?" If it lacked perfection, why did not God revise and perfect it when he wrote the second table? But it is said "he wrote on the tables according to the *first* writing—the ten commandments." Truly, "the law of the Lord is perfect." But here are several texts quoted as "proof to the contrary." I will notice but one of them, which I think will show the fallacy of his "proof." Take Acts ii, 38. Then Peter said unto them, repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for

the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." This text, with the rest, is referred to, doubtless to prove that *repentance, baptism, &c.*, also constitute a part of his *beau ideal* of God's "perfect law or rule of action." But does it prove any such thing? To me it clearly proves the *perfection* of a law, of which repentance and baptism are *not* a part. Let us see. What does repentance signify? It signifies that a just and perfect law has been violated; hence, *repentance* can be no part of that law. What of baptism? It signifies redemption from the penalty incurred in consequence of such violation; hence it can be no part of the law violated. The text says *repent*. But repent of what? Ans. Of *sin*. What is sin? "Transgression of the law." But sin is not the transgression of an *imperfect* law; therefore there must have been a *perfect* law violated to make repentance necessary. Why be baptized? Ans. To indicate death to sin; that we are no longer "transgressors of the law;" also redemption from death, through a resurrection to life. Then instead of *baptism* being a part of God's *perfect law*, it is a remembrance of sin, a reminder that such a law had been previously violated. Therefore, this text, like the rest, is not only of no avail to the objector, but is good testimony against him.

"19. Where is the *proof* that the *ten commandments* written on the *tables of stone* were ever transferred to the *fleshly tables of the apostles' hearts* on the day of Pentecost? *Echo* answers where? If they were, then we must read on the fleshly tables of the heart, precisely the language of the fourth commandment written on tables of stone. Please turn and read the fourth commandment. See Ex. xx, 8-10."

Is here an "argument" against the Sabbath? I

confess I am not far sighted enough to see it. In my judgment it is rather like the author's "*echo*,"—"a thing of naught,"—"a creature of imagination;" and it would be difficult indeed to determine which of the two contains the greater substance! As the one "vanishes into thin air," so does the other! Whether the ten commandments were transferred from the "tables of stone" to the "fleshly tables of the Apostles' hearts," on the day of pentecost—the day before, or the day after—is of no consequence whatever, so far as concerned their obedience, to the same, or the obligation they impose upon us, for they were binding and observed both before and after the day of pentecost,—whether written on "tables of stone," or "fleshly tables of the heart." But does Eld. S. take issue with the *main fact*, viz: The writing of the ten commandments in the hearts of God's people,—then his issue is with the word of God and not with me; for God says by his prophet, "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts." Jer. xxxi, 33. No one will deny that the ten commandments were a *part*, at least, of God's law in the days of Jeremiah, when this promise was made; hence to fulfill the prophecy, they must be embraced therein, and consequently written in the heart. And should the objector, in pursuance of his *one law* theory, include therein any *more* than the ten commandments, and perchance get into some difficulty thereby, with the typical and shadowy part of the same, under the new covenant; let him bear in mind that that is *his* business, not mine. But where was this prophecy to meet its fulfillment? Ans. Under the new covenant. See prophecy in Jer. xxxi, also Paul's reference to the same, Heb. viii. But the new covenant pertains to this dispensation and hence-

forward; whereof Christ is now the mediator. Therefore the ten commandments must be binding under the new covenant, and consequently in the present dispensation. "Then," says friend S., "we must read on the fleshly tables of the heart, precisely the language of the fourth commandment written on tables of stone." *Exactly so.* Not one jot or tittle of the language of the fourth commandment, or any of the *ten* would we have altered or stricken out. But does our objector ask the process by which God's law is written in the heart? I reply, it is "written not with *ink*, but with the spirit of the living God." 2 Cor. iii, 3.

"20. Will the keeping of the *ten commandments alone*, secure to any one eternal salvation in the kingdom of God? and do they constitute *man's whole duty*? Some say yes, look well to this! for there is great danger."

Suppose we admit the objectors claim, viz: That "the keeping of the ten commandments *alone*," will *not* secure "eternal salvation," and that they do *not* "constitute man's whole duty;" would such fact or admission, involve an "unanswerable argument," or even an *objection* against the observance of the Sabbath of the fourth commandment? Certainly not; for it would imply that something *more* was necessary, than keeping the ten commandments, rather than keeping *less* than ten. But again, if this question strikes a "death blow" to the fourth commandment, does it not also inflict nine mortal wounds upon the remainder of the decalogue? Such indeed would be the inevitable effect! But why need friend S. cut off *all* his toes simply to get rid of *one* useless and troublesome one! Such however is the sad havoc he makes in wielding the "sword of truth." Did I not tell him to be care-

ful in the use of this weapon? that this "sword" was a "two edged one? The caution he gives against great danger is timely! And I trust I may give a better example than he, in heeding a timely warning?

But now lest he should think I meant to evade the only point involved in his question,—which however has not the slightest bearing on the subject under discussion—I will say, once for all, that "Seventh-day Adventists" believe in keeping not only the *ten commandments*, but also the *faith* of our Lord Jesus Christ; or in other words, in order to "secure to any one eternal salvation in the kingdom of God," they believe it to be necessary to "keep the commandments of God and faith of Jesus." Rev. xiv, 12.

"21. Can the *ten commandments* constitute a *perfect law*, or man's whole duty when they neither require love to God or our neighbor? Any one can strictly keep the *ten precepts* and yet not love God nor his neighbor, for no one of them requires either. Turn and read each one of them carefully."

If it be a fact (!) that the ten commandments "neither require love to God or our neighbor," I answer they do not "constitute a *perfect law*, or man's whole duty," for Christ says, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul and with all thy mind," and also, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself;" and he says, furthermore, "On these two commandments hang *all* the law, and the prophets;" therefore if *all the law* hang on these two great principles, of love to God and love to our neighbor, most assuredly the *ten commandments* hang there,—the *fourth* with the rest,—*love* being the very *hook* on which they hang. Again, if the ten commandments "neither require love to God or our neighbor," I ask *what*

and *where* is the law that Christ referred to, as *then* hanging on those two great commandments? Was there no law under the former dispensation requiring love to God or our neighbor? If there was such a law, and it be *not* the ten commandments, will Eld. S. please to name it! Again I ask what is love to God or our neighbor but obedience to the precepts contained in the ten commandments? Or can a person love God or his neighbor without keeping the ten commandments? Paul says "the carnal mind is enmity against God, for it is not subject to the law of God, *neither indeed can be.*" I need not make an application of this text, the case is too apparent. I leave it with Eld S. however to make at his leisure.

"22. Where is the *evidence* that there was, or is any more holiness, spirituality, or sanctity attached to the seventh-day Sabbath, than there was, or is to every part or parcel of the *whole law* given by God through Moses to the children of Israel. True, the Sabbath is called "holy," and "my holy day," but it is never said to be *most holy*; while sacrifices, meat offerings, trespass-offerings, &c., are called *most holy*. One is used in the positive degree, and the other in the superlative. Let the reader examine the following testimony: Ex. xxxv, 1-3. Gen. ii, 3. Ps. lxxxvii, 1-7. Dan. ix, 24-27. Luke xxi, 20-24. Lev. xvi, 33. Ezek. v, 11. Dan. viii, 13, 14. Deut. xxviii, 8, 9. Ex. xix, 5, 6. Matt. xxiii. John viii. *Offerings most holy*, Num. xviii, 8-10. Ex. xxix, 37; xl, 10. Lev. ii, 3, 10; vi, 17; x, 12; vi, 25; vii, 1-6; xxi, 16-23; xxiv, 9. Num. iv, 4-19. Entire law holy, Rom. vii, 12, 14."

It is needless to produce "evidence" to controvert a point that has no bearing in the case. Were we to concede the point raised in the foregoing question, the fact would still remain, that "God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it," and also gave a solemn com-

mand to keep it *holy*, therefore whether it be *more* holy, or *less* holy than something else, is not a proper question for us to consider, and certainly is not the question in issue. Friend S. has doubtless some small knowledge of grammar, from the ready use he makes of the grammatical terms, "positive" and "superlative," but the use he makes of those terms, only confirms the truthfulness of the adage, that, "a little learning is a dangerous thing."

What if certain offerings and sacrifices are called "most holy," and the Sabbath only called "holy," what though the superlative be applied to the one, and the positive to the other; does it therefore follow that such offerings and sacrifices are more holy than the Sabbath, which the Lord has blessed and hallowed as his own? Certainly not. Why? Simply because they are not *compared* with each other. Hence, there is no significance whatever, in the comparison he labors to make. He should have considered this before making such a fatal blunder. But why is not the superlative term "most holy" applied to the Sabbath, as well as to offerings, &c? Because, that would imply that the Lord had a number of Sabbaths, and that one of them exceeded all the rest in holiness; whereas, the Lord has but *one* Sabbath—but *one* holy day,—he blessed and sanctified only the *seventh day*; therefore it is not susceptible of degrees of comparison; and hence may be regarded, and evidently was and is regarded by the Lord as much *more holy* than various other things, that are qualified by the superlative expression, "most holy." Therefore the multitude of texts presented in connection with the foregoing question, as vouchers for the exceedingly small point involved therein, not only come far short of proving the same, but show to

what extremes men will resort to find objections against the Sabbath. The foregoing however, is note-worthy in one respect at least. It presents the singular anomaly of not only *Multum in Parvo*, but *Parvum in Multo*.

"23. Where has God *removed* the holiness, spirituality, or sanctity attached to the *whole law*, any more than he has from the Sabbath commandment? The *entire law* was sanctified when it was given. It continued so through the Jewish economy, till the death of Christ, and it is a settled fact, that it is even so now, notwithstanding that the law has expired by limitation, or ceased its obligations upon the world."

God has *nowhere* "removed the holiness, spirituality or sanctity attached to the *whole law*, any more than he has from the Sabbath commandment;" hence we argue that the "*whole law*" is still binding. But what law, Eld. S. may inquire. I answer, the same "*entire law*" which by scripture reference he most clearly proves to be holy, viz: the ten commandments. See his last reference under question No. 22,—"*entire law* holy." Rom vii, 12-14. Here is good testimony, presented too, by an objector. Paul says in the text, "wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just and good." But Paul is speaking here *not* of a law that "had expired by limitation or ceased its obligation upon the world," but rather of a law that had convinced him of sin, viz., that law that says "Thou shalt not covet," verse 7. Of course Paul was not convinced of sin through the instrumentality of a law that had "ceased its obligations upon the world," hence the Mosaic law of types and shadows that was previously "nailed to the cross" did not constitute that "*whole law*" or "*entire law*" that is called *holy* in Rom. vii, 12.

But friend S. informs us here of a "settled fact," which, if it be a fact, is certainly worth knowing. His "settled fact," however, resolves itself into two facts(?) thus: 1st, The "entire law" "has expired by limitation, or ceased its obligations upon the world." 2d, This "entire law" not only was holy and spiritual "through the Jewish economy, till the death of Christ but "is even so now!"

How such facts as these can be reconciled in the light of truth and common sense is more than I can determine. "The law is *holy*,"—"the law is *spiritual*," Rom. vii, 12-14, but "has expired by limitation!" has "ceased its obligations upon the world!" Truly we are living under a strange dispensation! But *where, when, and by whom*, I ask, did such doctrine become a "settled fact?" In absence of proof to the contrary, I must conclude that such theology has *nowhere* become a "settled fact," except in the cranium of A. N. Seymour.

"24. Where is there the *least proof* that the seventh-day Sabbath is to be *perpetuated any longer* than the passover, priesthood, blowing of trumpets, burning of incense, offering of sacrifices, the practising of circumcision, &c., all of which was to be observed forever, throughout *their generations for a perpetual covenant*? Proof, Ex. xxxi, 12-18; xii, 11-17; xl, 15. Lev. xxiv, 1-9. Num. x, 1-8. Lev. xxiii, 1-22, 32-44. 2 Chron. ii, 4. Ex. xxx, 1-10. Ex. xl, 1-16; xxx, 17-21. Deut. v, 29; xi, 1. Ps. cxix, 112; xix, 7-11."

Did I fully acknowledge his kind of logic, I might present as a *poser* to his question, the following "argument." Where is the "least proof that the seventh day Sabbath "was to cease when the passover, priesthood, &c. ceased? We might wait for the "proof," but wait in vain.

But let us give a partial examination of his question. It will be conceded by all, and especially by our interrogating friend, that the terms "forever" and "perpetual," do not always signify unceasing duration,—otherwise the passover, priesthood, blowing of trumpets, &c., are still binding, and must continue to be until the end of time,—but their definite signification is determined rather from the nature of the person or thing to which they are applied, than from the words themselves. Or in other words, they signify the utmost extent of duration, of which the person or thing to which they relate are susceptible. For instance; are they applied to God or his attributes, they must necessarily signify unceasing duration; but are they applied to man or his works, they must necessarily imply limited duration. Again, are they applied to the passover, priesthood, offering of sacrifices, &c., they must from the nature of the same, imply limited duration; because their origin and destiny were with the Jewish nation, and the Jews being a typical people, these were instituted as types and shadows, and incorporated into their national polity, pointing directly to one object, as the full accomplishment of their design, viz., Christ. Therefore, when the substance or antitype was reached, the type and shadow must fail, the utmost extent of their duration having been fully accomplished. Not so however when applied to the Lord's Sabbath. The Sabbath is not a type. It was made at creation, before sin entered into the world, and therefore, before types were instituted or necessary. It is a memorial of the great work of creation, ever pointing backward instead of forward. The great fact upon which it is based, viz., that "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in

them is, and rested the seventh day," is just as much a fact to day, and ever will be, as when the same was uttered from mount Sinai, and written upon tables of stone. "The Sabbath was made for man," therefore is universal in its nature, and as applicable to one man as to another; or to one nation or people as to another. The same necessity and the same reasons for a Sabbath exist to-day, that existed three or four thousand years ago. The Sabbath commandment is incorporated into a law, which by its very nature is as eternal and enduring as the God that made it. Therefore, I conclude that when the term "forever" or "perpetual" is applied to the "seventh-day Sabbath," it not only implies that it will outlive the Jewish passover, priesthood, &c., but that it will continue unceasingly. Also, from the very nature of the Lord's Sabbath—without *any* qualifying terms—I am forced to the same conclusion, that it will not only continue *ad finem*, but *ad infinitum*. Isaiah lxvi, 22, 23.

"25. If the *fourth commandment* was binding from creation, did not the *whole host of Israel* break the Sabbath (and were not rebuked for it) when they traveled into the wilderness of Sin on the 15th day of the second month; the 22d of this month was a Sabbath, and the first from creation mentioned; running back seven days from the 22d, you strike the 15th again; which was a Sabbath, if any existed for observance at that time. See Ex. xvi."

Much more is here *assumed* than can be proved. In the first place, I will say that it is not unreasonable to suppose that the children of Israel at this time, were habitual Sabbath breakers, from the fact that they had but just been separated from the bondage and idolatrous customs of the Egyptian nation, where from compulsion and otherwise, they had easily learned to neg-

lect the Sabbath. And I now venture to assert,—friend S. to the contrary notwithstanding,—that when they murmured for bread in the wilderness of sin, the Lord rebuked them for the sin of Sabbath breaking, saying, "Behold I will rain bread from heaven for you, and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may *prove* them, whether they will walk in my law or no." This language is clearly a *rebuke* for violation of the Sabbath; otherwise there had been no force or significance in the peculiar expression, "gather a certain rate every day that I may *prove* them." Or had they been Sabbath *keepers*, there would have been no need whatever of such a test of obedience to God's law.

In the next place, I have to say, that though it be true that Israel came to the wilderness of Sin on the 15th day of the second month, there is no proof whatever, that that day was the Sabbath; neither is there a shade of proof that "the 22d of this month was a Sabbath." As the basis of such assertion, it is assumed, that much more was transacted by, and between the Lord and the children of Israel on the day that they came to the wilderness of Sin, than either the probabilities in the case, or the inspired record will warrant. Reference is made to Ex. xvi; but alas! the reference is made in vain. Like "the needle to the pole," the 16th chapter of Exodus is ever true to the Sabbath. But really, what an unfortunate chapter is this to the objector! There is no use, Eld. S., in trying to make Ex. xvi, bear testimony against the Sabbath.

"26. Did not Jesus Christ strictly enforce upon the *multitude*, and upon his *disciples* the *whole law* (of which the ten commandments compose a fraction) previous to

the crucifixion? *Some deny this*; but let me arraign them before the *standard of God's tribunal*, and let them, if they will, contend against his own immortal arm. See *Matt. xxiii, 1-3*. Oh, do not, I beseech you, make Christ a liar, and thus endanger your own eternal salvation."

Don't wax so bitter, friend S., for we are not going to take issue with you on this point. We admit that the *Mosaic law*, as well as the *ten commandments*, were in force previous to the crucifixion. But is this therefore an "unanswerable argument" against the Sabbath? I fail to perceive it. It is rather an argument for the Sabbath; for according to your own proposition, Christ enforced the "*whole law*, of which the *ten commandments* compose a fraction." Therefore he enforced the Sabbath commandment.

But who is A. N. Seymour, that he should presume to "arraign" men "before the standard of God's tribunal!" Who is he that he should "beseech" men not to "make Christ a liar!" Does *perfection* hang upon his lips, and reign supreme in his heart! Does *infallibility* pervade his very being, and assimilate him to angelic ranks above! One might think from his swelling language that he claimed even such distinction. "Let him that thinketh he standeth, take heed lest he fall."

"27. Where is the *least proof* that Christ or the twelve apostles ever enforced upon his disciples subsequent to the crucifixion, the *whole law* of God given by the hand of Moses, which was fulfilled, taken out of the way, nailed to the cross, abolished, and which we are delivered from and no longer under. *Matt. v, 17. Luke xxiv, 25-27, 44. Rom. x, 1-10. Rom. iii, 20, 21, 28; vii, 1-6. 2 Cor. iii, 6-13. Gal. ii, 16; iii, 19-25; iv, 19-31; v, 1-14. Eph. ii, 15. Col. ii, 14-17. Heb. vii, 12, 22; viii, 6-13; x, 7-10.*"

The question may be answered in one word; *no where*. It is not supposable that any one is foolish enough to believe that "Christ, or the twelve apostles ever enforced upon his disciples," or any body else a law that was "*taken out of the way, nailed to the cross, abolished, and which we are delivered from, and no longer under!*" The asking of such a question betrays an inexcusable weakness.

But what our friend would like to prove, is, that the ten commandments, together with the ceremonial law, were abolished or nailed to the cross. How astonishing it is, that men will resort to such unreasonable extremes, to get rid of the Sabbath. As much as to say,—the Sabbath is such an *ungodly institution*, that all things else, however good or holy *must fall*, that it may have a free road to perdition! Abolish the ten commandments! Does it look reasonable? Does it look God-like? That the ceremonial law, which consisted of types and shadows, pointing to Christ, and which received in him the full accomplishment of their design, should cease,—be nailed to the cross or abolished, is reasonable. There had been no significance in them, this side of the cross. They had served their time.

But was it so with the *ten commandments*? Had they served their time? Was there no longer any need of them? Had their observance to a *certain time* accomplished the whole object of their design? "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." What! This commandment "nailed to the cross?" So says our friend. "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image," &c. This "taken out of the way?" So we are told. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in

vain." Was this "abolished?" Eld. S. says so. "Remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy." This, of course, must have been abolished, for A. N. Seymour has produced "fifty unanswerable arguments" to prove it! "Honor thy father and thy mother." Write "fulfilled" against this commandment! No longer any need of it! Altogether too *Jewish* for this dispensation! "Thou shalt not kill." "Thou shalt not commit adultery." "Thou shalt not steal." "Thou shalt not bear false witness." "Thou shalt not covet." All these "taken out of the way, nailed to the cross, abolished, and which we are delivered from and no longer under!!!" O certainly! for these were all written in the law of Moses, and pertained exclusively to the Mosaic dispensation! And Christ says, Luke xxiv, 44, "All things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses," i. e., *come to an end!!!* Again, I am constrained to ask; does this look *reasonable*, or God-like?

But notwithstanding it be argued with so much gravity, that the ten commandments were abolished, it is admitted after all, that *nine* of them are not so very bad, but are quite *necessary* for observance, even in the *present* dispensation, and in fact do constitute a part of God's law at the present time. So, that by some singular process unfolded, the same "death-blow" that abolished from God's law the *ten commandments*, at the same moment re-instated therein *nine* of them! Our friend's position in regard to the ten commandments is much like that of a *novice* in "bowling at ten-pins." His exultation is all the same, whether attended with good or ill success. At a lucky moment he shouts, "*A ten strike!*" "*a ten strike!*" then again

with almost the next breath, and quite as rapturously as ever, he exclaims, "*All down but nine!*" So with the ten commandments. At one moment they are *all* abolished—all taken out of the way—at the next moment the exultant cry is, "*All down but nine!*"

For a full and thorough examination of the numerous texts referred to in the foregoing question, also for *indisputable* proof of the perpetuity of the ten commandments, the reader is respectfully referred to Eld. J. H. Waggoner's work entitled, "The Law of God."

"28. Where did Christ, the twelve apostles, or the seventy, ever call together a Christian congregation on the seventh-day Sabbath, and preach to them? That they preached on that day is admitted, but it was to the Jewish congregations, by request. Acts xiii, 15."

There happens to be one occasion, at least, recorded—enough to stop the mouth of our questioner—when Paul at Antioch preached on the Sabbath to the *Gentiles* by their request. Acts xiii, 42, 43. But the question is, did Christ or the apostles preach to "a Christian congregation on the seventh-day Sabbath?" It is *admitted* that they preached on that day; nor will it be denied that this was according to their *manner* and *custom*. Luke iv, 16; Acts xvii, 2. Now if it was according to their manner and custom to preach on the Sabbath, I submit that it is a poor compliment to their preaching to say that they never had "a Christian congregation" to hear them preach on such occasions. A *Christian* is one who believes in the religion of Christ. Think you, then, Eld. S., that with all the preaching done by Christ and the apostles on the Sabbath, they never had the happy privilege of preaching

to *Christians!* I choose to be excused from such a supposition.

"29. When the law of Sinai expired by limitation at the crucifixion, did another law take its place immediately? Most assuredly! Proof, Rom. iii, 27; viii, 2; vii, 22; Gal. vi, 3; James i, 25; ii, 12; Heb. ix, 15-18; x, 9, 10, 28, 29; John xii, 47-50. We are now under the law of God given by Christ, and not under the law of God given by Moses; that administrator, law, and dispensation having passed away. Christ is head of the church in this dispensation, consequently *administrator—Hear him!*"

What naked assumption! If it be a fact that the ten commandments expired by limitation at the crucifixion, and "another law" took their place "immediately," will Eld. S. who speaks "most assuredly" on this point, be good enough to tell us where may be found the *record* of that other law? When, where, and by whom, was it first spoken or written? The proof-texts referred to speak only of a certain law, or laws; but do not contain the law itself—nor do they refer the reader to the *book* or *chapter* that does contain it. Away then with such "proof." But in the foregoing proof-texts we are referred to the "law of faith"—"the law of the spirit of life"—"the law of God after the inward man"—"the law of Christ," and "the law of liberty." Now as these different expressions are referred to as *the law* that went into effect at the crucifixion, they of course must be synonymous with each other, and hence synonymous with the first expression, viz., "the law of faith," Rom. iii, 27, and therefore all must abide the rule that applies to it. Let us then try the strength of his proof from this text. And in so doing we have only to let Paul put a construction upon his own words, or draw his own con-

clusion. Will Eld. S. "*hear him?*" Verse 31. "Do we therefore make void the law through *faith?* God forbid: yea, we *establish* the law." But again, it is a well-known fact, that not one word of the New Testament was written at the time of the crucifixion, nor until several years afterward; therefore the law which we are told went into effect at that time, was not a *written law* prior to the writing of the New Testament. "Very well," says the objector, "but it was written when the New Testament was written." But the New Testament was written in fragmentary portions, by a variety of writers, and also at several different periods, during the space of over half a century. Was the law of God which took effect at the death of Christ, and which is still the moral rule of the world, written in the same manner? i. e., in fragmentary portions—a certain part by one writer at one time, another part at another time by a different writer, and still another fraction at still a different time! The idea is too absurd to be entertained for a moment.

Then perhaps the first New Testament writer—Matthew—when he seized the pen of inspiration, delayed not to give a complete copy of God's *new law*. Such were indeed a reasonable supposition if the foregoing assumption were true. But in vain do we search the record of Matthew for any such law. But though he omitted to give even an abstract of such law, he did not omit to furnish a record of Christ's memorable sermon on the mount, wherein he specially and plainly taught the perpetuity of the *old law*—that law that contained jots and tittles, and hence was already written in Hebrew. Christ said of it, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise

pass from the law, till *all* be fulfilled." But heaven and earth have not yet passed, nor have all the "prophets" yet been fulfilled; therefore the law of which Christ thus spake is still good and in force. Christ is indeed *administrator*, instead of *law-giver*. Will Eld. S. "hear him?"

"30. Where is there *one command* of God from the lips of Jesus Christ, or the inspired apostles to any Jew or Gentile, to observe the seventh-day Sabbath after the crucifixion of Christ? If *they* did not require it, pray tell me why should any at the present time? Do they not preach another Gospel? Judge ye!"

In Ex. xx there is "one command of God" given by *himself*, "to observe the seventh-day Sabbath." And since that command has never been revoked by God himself, neither by "Jesus Christ or the inspired apostles," it is just as binding "after the crucifixion of Christ" as before that event. Therefore those who advocate the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath, are not guilty of preaching "another gospel." "Judge ye!"

"31. Where does the Comforter, or Holy Spirit, or Spirit of Truth, which was to *guide* the apostles and church into all truth guide any one into the seventh-day Sabbath keeping? If the Holy Ghost never guided any one into this observance on the day of Pentecost, nor at the household of Cornelius, why will men do so now? Are they not wise above that which is written; and have they not run before they are sent? Father says (and I believe what Father says to be true, for I never knew him to lie), that prophet *shall die*, that shall presume to speak a word in my name which I have not commanded him to speak. Deut xviii, 20. Dear brethren and sisters, let us obey our good Father, for he has raised us up a great proph-

et, and says to us, *Hear him in all things*. Children, let us anoint our eyes with eye-salve that we may comprehend the truth."

In answer to the first question I reply thus: Wherever there is a *willingness* to be guided by the *truth*, and the way is not hedged up with unbelief, false theories, or the traditions of men, *there*, and *there only*, will the "Spirit of Truth" "guide any one into the seventh-day Sabbath keeping." In reply to the second question I have only to say that Eld. S. has *assumed* what remains to be *proved*, viz., that the "Holy Ghost never guided any one into this observance on the day of Pentecost, nor at the house of Cornelius." Until the assumption be proved, there is no pertinence whatever in the question. His next statement in regard to his "Father," and the cogent reason he assigns for having such confidence in him, are very *suggestive* at least, as well as extremely simple. In the absence of any *disclaimer* to the contrary, one might possibly conclude—and not without a fair show of reason—that a reference to John viii, 44 were intended.

But the closing exhortation in the foregoing "unanswerable argument" (?) is in good keeping with the rest. Of all the quack remedies recommended in the world for the various ills of mankind, the last one heard of, and doubtless the most noted of all, is the one suggested by friend S.; viz., the anointing of a person's "eyes with eye-salve" to make him "*comprehend*!" Not being particularly credulous in regard to the recommendations of quack nostrums, I am strongly inclined to doubt the real utility of the late discovery of Eld. Seymour. I would recommend him however to give the "eye-salve" a thorough application upon himself, for it is very evident that he has

not yet done so; otherwise it *totally* fails to answer its recommendation.

"32. Which law of commandments are Christians under now, the one given by God to Moses, which is abolished, Eph. ii, 15, or the one given by God to Christ and the twelve apostles, Rev. xii, 17; xiv, 12; xxii, 14; 1 Cor. xiv, 37; Acts xx, 20, 27."

God gave to Moses a "law of commandments contained in *ordinances*" (rites and ceremonies) Eph. ii, 15, which all agree are abolished. God also gave to Moses a law of commandments *not* contained in ordinances, written on tables of stone, which is not abolished, as we have shown, and which therefore "*Christians are now under.*" I have yet to learn that any law of commandments was "given by God to Christ and the twelve apostles," except that which was spoken from mount Sinai, and recorded in the Scriptures of truth, when they came upon the stage of action. Such is not shown to be true from the proof-texts referred to, neither is it anywhere affirmed in the Bible. Is not friend S. "wise above that which is written?" and has he not "run before he is sent?" I am surprised, however, that he should think of bringing to his aid such texts as Rev. xii, 17—"And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ." If he were to anoint his eyes with the *genuine* "eye-salve," he might doubtless be enabled to discover that the dragonic warfare mentioned in the text was being performed in a remarkable manner by *himself*!

"33. Where is there *one text* in all the Living Oracles of God, stating that all his commandments which are sure and stand fast for ever and ever, mean the

ten on the tables of stone, no more, no less. This is an unwarrantable assumption, without a shadow of proof to sustain it. God's commandments are numerous both in the Old and New Testaments; but since Christ, we are under God's commandments given by Christ, the Holy Ghost, and the twelve apostles."

When Eld. S. will prove that all of God's commandments which are sure, and stand fast for ever and ever, mean any *less* than the ten, I will engage to further consider his question. Until then it is not necessary, so far as relates to the question in issue, viz., the obligation of the seventh-day Sabbath. In regard to the last clause in the foregoing I have only to say, that it "is an unwarrantable assumption without a shadow of proof to sustain it." God's commandments were "*given*" by himself. "Christ, the Holy Ghost, and the twelve apostles" *enjoined* their obligation.

"34. Why did not the apostles, when they turned to the Gentiles to preach Christ and the gospel, *teach* the obligation of the *fourth* commandment? The Gentiles were ignorant of the Sabbath and the law, for they were without law, without hope, and without God in the world, and strangers to the covenants of promise. Eph. ii, 12."

The apostles taught the obligation of the whole law, as I have heretofore shown from a number of references; therefore they did not except the fourth commandment. That the apostles in their writings did not *specialy*, and in positive terms, enforce the obligation of the Sabbath, affords no argument against such obligation. But the apostle James failed not to teach on this wise: "For whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet offend in *one* point, he is guilty of all. For he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou

kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law." Now I ask, will it be doing any violence to the teaching of James to carry his illustration still farther? thus: "For he that said, Thou shalt not steal, said also, Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Now if thou steal not, yet if thou *break the Sabbath*, thou art become a transgressor of the law." Thus James just as clearly teaches the obligation of the *fourth* precept of the decalogue, as he does of the seven other precepts not named in his illustration. How this conclusion can be avoided is more than I can tell. But Eld. S. refers to Eph. ii, 12-as proof that the "Gentiles were ignorant of the Sabbath and the law." I am free to admit the proof, though the text does not declare it in positive terms. It will be readily seen that Paul was here contrasting the former condition of those to whom he wrote, with their then present condition. If therefore the 12th verse proves that in "time past" (ver. 11) "the Gentiles were ignorant of the Sabbath and the law," the *next verse* and onward, proves the contrary to have been true at the time the apostle wrote, viz., *not* ignorant of the Sabbath and the law. "But *now* in Christ Jesus ye who *sometimes were far off*, are made *nigh* by the blood of Christ." Unto what were they made nigh? Manifestly those things from which they "sometimes were far off." But among those things, according to the admission of Eld. S., were "*the Sabbath and the law*." Again the proof-text of Eld. S. informs us that the Gentiles *were* (i. e., in "time past") "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel." But the apostle says in the 19th verse, "*Now* therefore ye are no more *strangers and foreigners*." Why? Because ye are "made nigh by the blood of Christ." The "middle wall of partition"

(ver. 14) being now broken down, the Gentiles were inducted into, and made acquainted with, all the blessings and privileges that pertained to the commonwealth of Israel; and Eld. S. will admit that among those were "*the Sabbath and the law*." Will Eld. S. dodge the force of this argument? It is one of his own suggestion.

"35. The twelve apostles were holy men, and spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Where were they *moved*, as messengers, to preach the fourth precept, and make it an entering wedge, or hobby to every thing else they had to say? They preached the *whole counsel of God*, and kept back nothing that was *profitable* to the church. They did keep back the seventh-day Sabbath, consequently we conclude that it is not profitable. Who will spend their time, talents, and means, in publishing that which is not profitable? Who? I choose better employment, don't you my brother, my sister? Matt. xxviii, 19, 20; Deut. xviii, 18; John viii, 28, 29; xii, 49, 50; xvii, 8; Acts xx, 20, 27; 2 Cor. iii, 6; iv, 1-7; v, 18-20."

A very sensible choice, friend S., and no doubt your affectionate appeal to your "brother" and your "sister" will meet a hearty approval. But why did you not think of this before you commenced your *unprofitable tract* against the Sabbath? Or having thought of it just here, how happens it that we have eight pages more of the *same sort*? Surely, after having arrived at such a rational conclusion one might suppose that you would have dropped your pen at once, or else have commenced immediately to devote your "time, talents, and means" to the publication of something that might possibly be deemed "*profitable*."

But why do you say that the apostles "did keep back the seventh-day Sabbath?" If you say this with reference to what they *preached*, I may say that it

is an "unwarrantable assumption." For aught the Bible says to the contrary, the apostles in their preaching may have made as much of "an entering wedge or hobby" of the Sabbath, as ever the seventh-day Adventists do. For *all* that they preached is not, by any means, recorded in the Bible; therefore not for Eld. S. to know. Acts xx, 20, 27, has been referred to before, also the expression, "whole counsel of God," but what do these texts prove? They prove that Paul during the "three years" that he "ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears," (ver. 31,) and during which time he taught "publicly and from house to house," (verse 20) "kept back nothing that was profitable;" also verse 27, that he "shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God." And now, believing that the observance of *all* the ten commandments was "profitable," and believing also that they were *all* embraced in "the whole counsel of God," I cannot be persuaded to believe that the apostle kept *any* of them back, or shunned to declare the whole of them during the course of his public ministry. Before you quote these texts again, friend S., to prove that the apostle did *not* preach the obligation of the Sabbath, you should first prove that the obligation of the Sabbath is *not* profitable, and does not pertain to the *whole counsel of God*. This you will find to be a difficult task. Your list of scripture references make a fair show on paper, but they afford you no aid whatever; for with the simple exception above noticed, they bear no relation to any thing asserted under the foregoing number; and if possible still less to the question in issue.

"36. Why is not the sin of Sabbath-breaking men-

tioned anywhere in the various catalogues of sins in the New Testament? All Protestant denominations are Sabbath-breakers, if the fourth precept is binding, besides all the unbelieving world; and why did not the apostles thunder forth their anathemas against Sabbath-breakers in these last days, and tell them they had got the mark of the beast, and consequently must drink the 'wine-cup of God's wrath?' Did God leave this to some few Sabbath-preachers to work out, independent of his counsel? Perhaps God may have revealed it in some *vision* to Mrs. White; but I confess that it is extremely doubtful after the knowledge I have of them. I wonder if James White is not the father of her visions?"

Why was not the Bible written in such *plain English* that there could be no possible chance for a difference of opinion in regard to its teachings and doctrines? It was not so written. In the arrangement of God, the great truths of the Bible were so left upon the page of inspiration, that those who are disposed to doubt and cavil, may find plenty wherewith to gratify their carnal inclinations. Therefore I may say that the "sin of Sabbath-breaking" is not mentioned in the New Testament that cavilers may cavil, that quibblers may quibble, and that there may be furnished a convenient handle for stubborn unbelief. It is true "Protestant denominations" generally are "Sabbath-breakers, if the fourth precept is binding." But what if such is the case? It only proves that it is no less true now, than it was when our Saviour was upon the earth, that the most popular and distinguished people of the age have "made the commandments of God of none effect by their tradition." Matt. xv, 6. As the scribes and Pharisees anciently regarded the "tradition of the elders" of greater importance than the *fifth* commandment, so do "Protestant de-

nominations"—their true representatives at the present time—regard the traditions of the fathers of more consequence than the *fourth* commandment. How appropriate *now* would be the rebuke of our Saviour, "Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition?" But to the astonishment of Eld. S., if the fourth precept is binding "*all the unbelieving world*" are also *Sabbath-breakers*! Can it be possible! Doubtless such is a true and logical conclusion; for the "*unbelieving world*," not unlike himself, generally regard all days alike,—putting "no difference between the holy and the profane." Since Eld. S. is a professed advent believer I will answer his next question as follows: Why did not the apostle John tell us that the great red dragon which he saw, was Pagan Rome; and the beast with ten horns, the Papacy? Why did he not thunder forth his anathemas against the sins and corruptions of the popes, and tell them that their dynasty was the beast? Did God leave this to some few advent preachers to work out independent of his counsel? The scoffs that follow demand no reply. They betray a weakness that deserves, perhaps, quite as much pity as contempt. Pass them by.

"37. Where is there *one text* in the Bible which says the keeping of the seventh-day Sabbath is the *seal* of the living God, and seal of this dispensation? The Sabbath is truly said to be a *sign*, but never a seal; there is a difference between their signification. The truth is, there is a seal to every dispensation. Circumcision is the seal of the Patriarchal—the law, the Jewish—the Holy Spirit, the gospel; and Father's name, the future and eternal age. May we ascertain to a moral certainty that we have the seal of this gospel age, that ultimately we may enjoy the realization of Father's name for ever."

In the foregoing, friend S. has assumed to tell us

what "the truth is" in regard to the seal of God, though his assertions are naked, there being no proof to back them up. He is very particular to call on us repeatedly for the "*one text*" which says thus and so, according to his *own form* of expression, but is quite neglectful to back up his own assertions in like manner. The reason is obvious. Since he has given us no Scripture proof, nor any good reason or argument that "there is a seal to every dispensation," the assertion amounts to but little. That there should be a seal to God's law, i. e.; something to show its authority, and the extent of its jurisdiction, is self-evident, and not contrary to Scripture or sound reason; for a law, whether human or divine, to be effective, must contain in itself authority; it must in a proper manner identify the law-giver, or law-making power; or in short, it must be *confirmed*. And whatever constitutes such confirmation, or shows the real authority of the law, may be distinguished as the *seal* thereof. But that there should be a seal peculiar to a "dispensation," or "age," is, in my judgment, an absurd idea. But let us examine for one moment our friend's theory.

1. Circumcision was not peculiar to the patriarchal dispensation, for it was also practiced during the Jewish. If therefore circumcision was the *seal* of the patriarchal dispensation, what was it during the Jewish dispensation, whereof we are told the *law* was the seal?

2. The law, i. e., the *ceremonial*, though peculiar to the Jewish dispensation, is nowhere affirmed to be the seal thereof. And the ten commandments, or God's moral law, as I have heretofore shown, are not peculiar to any age, but common to all, hence it is not the seal of any particular age or dispensation.

3. The Holy Spirit, though in some respects it may be deemed peculiar to the present, or gospel, dispensation, is not declared to be the *seal* of God, but the *sealer*. Eph. iv, 30. "And grieve not the Holy Spirit whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption."

4. The Father's name is not peculiar to the "future and eternal age," for it is to be written in the forehead during the probationary state. Compare Rev. xiv, 1, with Rev. vii, 1-4. But under this head let us inquire what the Father's name signifies? I answer, It is a figurative term signifying the Father's authority; for name signifies authority. When we say, in the name of the people, we mean by authority of the people; in the name of the king, by authority of the king; in the name of Jesus Christ, by authority of Jesus Christ, &c. Then, indeed, the *Father's name* signifies the same as the *seal of God*. But having seen that our friend's theory will not hold to reason or facts, I ask, Where shall we look for the Father's name, or the seal of God? I answer, In his moral law, for there his rightful authority to rule and reign must of necessity be clearly shown. And truly enough, in the *fourth* commandment, and not in any other, we do find the evidence of such authority; for the fourth commandment alone points out and identifies the only true God, in contradistinction to all false gods; viz., the Maker of heaven and earth, and Creator of all things. The Sabbath then is given as a sign of the knowledge of the true God, and as a token of his authority; therefore it is the seal of the living God. At first view, to us who are favored with a knowledge of the true God, this reasoning may seem to lack force; but when we go back to first principles and consider ourselves as having no knowledge of God, worshippers of idols, or as Paul said of the Gentiles,

"without God in the world," then perhaps we may more fully realize the force and application of the foregoing truth. Let the law of God be presented to us under such circumstances, and I doubt not the *seal* would readily appear, and commend itself to our judgment.

Whilst this view of the Sabbath seems so reasonable and apparent, it is also in accordance with the Scriptures. See Ex. xxxi, 13, 16, 17; Eze. xx, 12, 20. Here inspiration calls the Sabbath a *sign* between God and the children of Israel forever, and they were to observe the same throughout their generations for a *perpetual* covenant. (See remarks on forever and perpetual, under question No. 24.) But the generations of the Israelites are not yet extinct. There are true Israelites still upon the earth. Therefore the Sabbath is still a valid sign, or the seal of God, between him and those who are "Israelites indeed." That *sign* and *seal* are used interchangeably in the Scriptures, and signify the same thing, friend S. to the contrary notwithstanding, I have only to refer to what Paul said of Abraham. Rom. iv, 11. "He received the *sign* of circumcision, a *seal* of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised."

"38. If the church is under obligation to her first husband, Moses and the law, that being still alive, which is the faith of some; and if the Christian church is married to Christ, which no man can doubt, then I ask in all candor if the church has not been living in *adultery* for the last eighteen hundred years? Christ is the lawful husband of the church; the former one, Moses and the law, being dead. See Rom. vii, 1-6. *Hear him*, says Father. Will you listen to him?"

If your "father," Eld. S. teaches what you here assert, my former opinion as to his identity seems to be

fully confirmed. John viii, 44. I therefore choose not to "listen to him," for in the question before me I too plainly see the sad effects of so doing. It is evident from the false assertions and the false reasoning contained in the foregoing, that the child is faithful to the teaching of the sire. The plea of "all candor" is only a disguise; it is a family trait, and only makes the deception all the more apparent. Another family characteristic is also noticeable in the fact of the proneness of Eld. S. to get up a contention in regard to the condition or whereabouts of Moses. Jude 9. And doubtless, the reply given by the archangel to the head of the family, is equally applicable to the junior member: "The Lord rebuke thee."

Moses is indeed *dead*, friend S., as you affirm! The Scriptures inform us that he *died* in the land of Moab! Therefore I shall take no issue with you on this point. But that the *law* is dead of which Paul spake in the 7th of Romans, is quite another thing. Paul does not say so, the Scriptures nowhere affirm it, nor will a common sense interpretation of the chapter in question admit of such a verdict. Neither does Paul say, or even intimate, that "Moses and the law" is the first husband of the church. This, like the former assertion, is without proof. In fact, Paul makes no allusion whatever, in the 7th of Romans, to Moses, or the Mosaic law that was nailed to the cross. This is evident, from the fact that he speaks of a law that is *operative*, and gives the effect of the same upon himself, which therefore cannot be the law that "ceased its obligation upon the world" several years previous to the time of his conversion, and religious experience. But we are not without positive proof on this point. In the

7th verse, the apostle clearly identifies the law of which he is speaking. It is the law of ten commandments.

But Eld. S., if your theory be true, I would also ask, in all candor, what has been the condition of the church for the last eighteen hundred years? I affirm that *adultery* is chargeable to your theory, rather than ours. Let us see. If the *law* of which Paul speaks is the first husband, and the *law* is dead, as you affirm, then indeed is the church living in adultery; *not being married at all*; there being no law to bind her to the second husband. But let us look at the matter in the light of truth and common sense. Let Paul's illustration have a *natural* application, and all is clear. To illustrate the great and important truths involved in the work of Scriptural conversion, inspiration has chosen the simple yet very appropriate figure of marriage. In the illustration, four characters are prominently brought to view; the woman, the law of marriage, the first husband and the second husband. In making an application of the figure, we must be careful not to lose sight of the characters brought to view. We should also bear in mind that *death* is spoken of, only with reference to the *first* husband, and that the death of the husband can in no way affect or change the law of marriage; but simply operates as a release to the woman from its binding power, so that she is at liberty to marry another husband. And though she marries the second husband, it is not by virtue of a new law, but by authority of the same law that solemnized her former marriage. Now for the application. 1st. What is represented by the woman? Since the woman must be married to the second husband, to make the figure

complete, and since the second husband represents Christ, as all concede, it follows that the woman represents such as shall finally be saved by virtue of a union with him. Then of course she must represent those who "shall be heirs of salvation," or candidates for eternal life, for only such become legally joined to Christ, the second husband. 2d. The law of marriage represents the law of God. 3d. What does the first husband represent? Here is where Eld. S. does not see clearly. Let him apply the "eye-salve." Let it be remembered that in the *figure*, it is the first husband that *dies*, and so makes the second marriage lawful. Then in the application we must have something to correspond with the figure. But what is the *modus operandi* of Scriptural conversion? What must *die* before a legal union with Christ can be effected? All will say the *carnal mind*; or as Paul has elsewhere expressed it, "the *old man* which is corrupt." Then it is very clear that the first husband represents the *carnal mind*, or the *old man*; and the second husband, the *new man*, which is our Lord Jesus Christ. The following texts are in harmony with this view, and speak to the point: "That ye put off concerning the former conversation, the *old man*, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the *new man*, which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness." Eph. iv, 22-24. "Lie not one to another, seeing ye have put off the *old man* with his deeds, and have put on the *new man*, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of Him that created him." Col. iii, 9, 10.

Whatever may be said of the impracticability of

making certain parables or figures stand on "all fours," here is one that stands thus *literally*, and needs no propping. The apostle's conclusion is also in harmony with the foregoing view. "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law (quite different from saying that the law is dead,) by the body of Christ, that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead," verse 4. "But now we are delivered from the law, *that* being dead *wherein* we were held," verse 6. This expression is claimed by some—Eld. S. particularly—as proving the death and abolishment of the law. This is a great mistake. In the *figure*, deliverance from the law of marriage was effected in consequence of the death of the first husband. So in the application, deliverance from the law of God, i. e., from its condemnation; or what is the same thing, released from the power of sin and made free to be united with Christ; is brought about in consequence of the death of the *old man*, or subjugation of the *carnal mind* to the will of God. Hence, being "delivered from the law," in the sense in which the apostle uses the expression, can not possibly be construed to mean the abolition of the law. Nor does the expression "that being dead wherein we were held," mean the death of the law; for the word "*that*" does not relate to the *law*, but to that state or condition in which the person is held *by* the law previous to the death of the first husband, which was a state of sin or carnal mindedness; or as Paul has it, "Sold under sin," verse 14. Then instead of the death of the law, the foregoing expression means the death of sin or carnal mindedness; for *therein* "we were held;" and the language of the text is, "*that* being dead *wherein* we

were held." The marginal reading perhaps is better, "being dead to that wherein we were held," i. e., being dead to sin or carnal mindedness. This is in harmony with other scriptures. "How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" Rom. vi, 2. Also verse 11, "Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Also, 1 Peter ii, 24, "That we being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness."

Such, in my judgment, is the natural, consistent and truthful view of the 7th of Romans.

"39. Where is there *one jot or tittle of testimony* in the second will, or testament, or law of the Spirit, or of faith, or of liberty, denouncing any one as a sinner, who violates the fourth commandment, during the Gospel dispensation? Is there *no penalty* for the violation of so important a command, if binding? What, and where is it?"

The above question, in substance, is but a repetition of several former ones, therefore demands but a passing notice. The law of liberty, to which reference is made in the foregoing question, is composed of the ten commandments. James ii, 11, 12; therefore the fourth commandment is embraced therein. And James in commenting on this law, in the 10th verse, informs us that whosoever offends in one point, is guilty of all; or as expressed in the 11th verse, "becomes a transgressor of the law." And another apostle informs us that the transgression of the law is *sin*, 1 John iii, 4. The "*penalty*" that is enquired for, may be found in plain language in Rom. vi, 23. "The wages of sin is death." Here then is a "*jot or tittle of testimony*," which is all that friend S. calls for.

"40. Does not the union formed between Jews and Gentiles by the cross of Christ, constitute the *new man*? If so, did the Gentiles constitute any part of the "*man*" that existed previously, for whom the Sabbath was made? See Rom. ii, 1, 3, 17. James i, 1; ii, 20. Eph. ii, 15. 1 Pet. ii, 10. Rom. ix, 25, 26. Hosea i, 9, 10."

Possibly Eld. S. may have had a definite idea in his mind, when he penned the foregoing; but if he had, I greatly doubt whether any of his readers have been able to perceive what it was, either from the question asked, or from the proof texts given. I *infer* that the foregoing questions and texts are designed as an argument against the Sabbath, *only* from the fact that they are numbered among the "fifty." Were it not for this fact, I should not have the least suspicion that such was their design. But the foregoing reasoning, if such it may be called, is evidently defective. Eld. S. makes a great mistake at the outset, in confounding the term "*the new man*," with another term, "*one new man*." The former occurs only in Eph. iv, 24 and Col. iii, 10, and is there used in connection or contrast with its proper antithesis, "*the old man*." The latter occurs only in Eph. ii, 15, and is there used in no such sense or connection as the former expression. There is indeed, a wide difference in the Scriptural signification of the two expressions. But, if it be insisted that "the union formed between Jews and Gentiles by the cross of Christ, constitutes "*the new man*," of Eph. iv, 24, and Col. iii, 10, then the antithesis therein brought to view, "*the old man*," must be the disunion that existed between Jews and Gentiles before the cross of Christ! Therefore, the Sabbath, being made for man before the cross of Christ, it must have been made for the *old man*, that "existed previously," i. e., for *Jews*

and Gentiles, in their state of *disunion*! I submit that such is the logical conclusion of our friend's theory. Is he satisfied with it? Perhaps not. I will therefore produce an "unanswerable argument" that he cannot fail to appreciate. Christ said, "the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." Mark ii, 27. Paul said, "Neither was the man created for the woman, but the woman for the man." 1 Cor. xi, 9.

Now then I ask, if "the union formed between Jews and Gentiles by the cross of Christ, constitutes the new man," "did the Gentiles constitute any part of the '*man*' that existed previously for whom the '*woman*' was made? Friend S. have you a wife? How dare you—being a Gentile—appropriate such a boon to yourself?

"41. How much of the law was Israel required to keep in order to salvation? Let James answer, "Who-soever shall keep the *whole law*, and yet offend in *one point*, is guilty of all." What is embraced in the *whole law*? Ans., the five books of Moses. The expressions, "as the Lord commanded Moses," or similar ones occur 80 times in Exodus, 40 times in Lev., 101 times in Num., and 63 times in Deut. Will any one have the audacity to say that they keep the *whole law*, when they only pretend to keep ten specifications, which are only a prominent fraction of the entire law? Who then are guilty and under condemnation continually? Let those who have the mind of Christ, answer. James ii, 10. Gal. v, 1-9. Ps. xix, 7. The *whole law* will convert a soul, but a part never will.

I am surprised, Eld. S., at the doctrine you advocate under the foregoing number. Heretofore, you have said much about Moses and the law being dead—nailed to the cross—expired by limitation—ceased its obligations upon the world, &c. But now, strange as it may

seem, we find you advocating the perpetuity of the "*whole law*," which, according to your view, embraces not only the ten commandments, but all "the five books of Moses." And though you have often appealed to the teachings of the apostles for the proof that the "*whole law*" is dead, we now find you bringing to your aid the apostle James, and attempting to make him teach the obligation of "the five books of Moses!"

I cannot think it is your *intention* to take a position so contrary to that which you have held heretofore; but such is the fact, for if the five books of Moses are embraced in the "*whole law*" of which James speaks in the 2d chap. of his epistle, then in the most emphatic manner, the apostle teaches their obligation; for he there teaches the obligation of the "*whole law*," informing us that whosoever offends in *one point* is guilty of all; and illustrates his teaching thus: "If thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law." And John says that the transgression of the law is sin. It should be remembered that James wrote for the benefit of the gospel dispensation, and that he does not undertake to say "how much of the law" the Jews *were* required to keep in the former dispensation; but rather how much Christians are required to keep in the present or gospel dispensation, which, as before shown, is not a part but the whole, and which if you are correct, is the five books of Moses. Again, you give the most powerful reason that can be given in proof of the perpetuity of the "*whole law*," or, as you term it, the five books of Moses, viz., "The *whole law* will convert a soul, but a part never will." If it be a fact, that it requires the five books of Moses to convert a soul,

then indeed is the controversy ended! Let us all go to keeping the Mosaic law in earnest! In thus inadvertently sustaining the five books of Moses, you of course sustain the Sabbath, and have, therefore, raised no issue with me on that point. But really, friend S., what sad work you make in wielding the "sword of truth!" Reader, can you not plainly discover his blunder? It is all from the fact that he makes no distinction between the moral and the ceremonial law.

"42. How much of the law does God acknowledge to be his? Considerable capital has been made out of the expressions, "*my holy day*," "*my Sabbaths*," as though there was some thing peculiarly remarkable in them, that the author was nearer related to that sentiment than others contained in the same category. But God not only says *my Sabbaths*, but *my Statutes*, *my Judgments*, *my Commandments*, Lord's Passover, *my Offerings*, *my Feasts*, *my Sacrifices*, *my Covenant* and *my Law*. So, you discover, the relation is just as near to one as the other; they are all lawful, holy and spiritual children, bearing the same identity as regards relative importance. So let Sabbath-advocates twist and turn which way they will, and "run to each avenue and shriek for help, yet they shriek in vain." God's holy word meets them at every turn and twist, unsheathed, and cuts their theory on every side."

With due modesty, Eld. S., I venture to repel your charge, by saying that *twisting* and *turning* is not the work of "Sabbath advocates." The word of the Lord in regard to the Sabbath, is too plain to require that kind of practice. But the man that undertakes to prove that the law of God is abolished, or that the Lord's Sabbath is blotted out therefrom, will doubtless find the art of *twisting* and *turning* peculiarly adapted to his business. "Judge ye!" "Thou art the man!" As to running to various avenues and *shrieking* in vain for

help, I have only to say, that the latest specimens of that kind of shrieking are brought to notice, remarkably, in the tract before me, by A. N. Seymour.

In regard to the "considerable capital," that you say has been made by the expressions, "*My holy day*," and "*My Sabbaths*," I can assure you, that it is "capital" that the Lord has furnished. And it is consoling to know that he has left an abundant capital to the disposal of all such as desire to take stock in his truth. When you seek to identify the weekly Sabbath of the Lord, with the annual sabbaths of the Jews, or to place them upon the same footing, as to duration and importance, it is enough to show that the Lord has regarded them in a different light, and that he has made a wide distinction between them. The above forms of expression are important items of the "capital" that is furnished for this purpose. The Lord instituted the one as a *weekly* memorial of his rest from creation; the others were given as annual memorials of certain events connected with the deliverance of the Hebrews from Egypt. Therefore the one is very appropriately designated by such expressions as "*My holy day*," "*My Sabbaths*," "the Sabbath of the Lord," &c., whilst the others are termed, "*Your Sabbaths*," "*Her Sabbaths*," &c. Compare Ex. xx, 10; xxxi, 13; Isa. lviii, 13, with Lev. xxiii, 24, 32, 39; Lam. i, 7; Hosea ii, 11.

Surely the above "shriek" cannot be regarded as an "unanswerable argument against seventh-day Sabbath keeping."

"43. Did the apostle Paul preach on the seventh-day Sabbath? Yes. Did he preach 78 or 84 Sabbaths? Yes. Was this his custom? Yes, yes! *Why*

did he do all this? Paul, stand up here and answer for yourself, and give these Judaizers a plain strait-forward, thorough-going, penetrating, Holy Ghost answer. 'For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all *that I might gain the more*; and unto the Jews I became as a Jew; (*What for, Paul?*) That I might gain the Jews;—to them that are under the law, as under the law; (*What for, Paul?*) That I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law, [being not without law to God but under the law to Christ;] (*What for?*) That I might gain them that are without law, [these are Gentiles;] to the weak, became I as weak; (*What for?*) That I might gain the weak; I am made all things to all men. (*What for?*) That I might by all means save some.' Now Paul, *thou sent of God*, what did you do all this for? have you a valid reason? *Hear him!* 'This I do for the *Gospel's sake*, that I might be a partaker there with you.' There thou ever faithful and venerable apostle, you have driven the nail in a sure place, and more than clinched it if possible.—1 Cor. ix, 19-23."

"O shame, where is thy blush!" "Paul, stand up here and answer for yourself!" To say nothing of *irreverence*, modesty should have suggested the use of language more *respectful*, at least. Were the great apostle only conscious of the smart-little-school-boy catechising that Eld. S. has given him, he would, no doubt, consider himself exceedingly flattered! and especially so, in view of the school-boy praise that is so lavishly bestowed upon him, for having so well recited his task!

As a reply to the foregoing, it would be enough to say that the language of Paul, quoted above, (1 Cor. ix, 19-23,) is not given by him as the reason for his custom of preaching on the seventh-day Sabbath. Seymour gives it as such, but Paul does not. But if Eld.

S. is willing to receive the foregoing language of Paul as the reason for such custom, I will also receive it as such. Let us then examine the argument. This, I think we shall discover, is extremely leaky! It is admitted that Paul preached on the seventh-day Sabbath. It is also admitted with an emphatic "*yes, yes*," that this was his *custom*. The question then asked by Eld. S. is, "*Why did he do all this?*" Paul, after being commanded to "*stand up*," proceeds to answer, and gives four specific reasons, as follows:

1st. Unto the Jews, he became as a Jew; i. e., preached on the seventh-day Sabbath. Very clear indeed, says Eld. S. But Paul is here *answering for himself*, and we must hear him through. He has three reasons yet to offer. 2d. Unto them that are under the law, he became as under the law; i. e., preached on the seventh-day Sabbath. But hold, says Eld. S., this needs *explanation*! This is not so clear! Here, indeed, is where his argument begins to leak. But, don't dodge, Eld. S., for if the *first* reason is good, the *second*, *third* and *fourth* are also good. They are all *locked* together, and the same key fits every lock. 3d. Unto them that are without law, (the Gentiles) he became as without law; i. e., preached on the seventh-day Sabbath. Another bad leak, surely. But if the argument is good, that preaching on the Sabbath made Paul a Jew when among Jews; then it is equally good, that preaching on the Sabbath made him a Gentile when among Gentiles; and in fact, the language must be so construed, otherwise, Paul's "*thorough-going, penetrating, Holy-Ghost answer*," does not answer the purpose for which it was introduced; viz., to show the reason for his *custom* of preaching on the Sabbath. 4th.

Unto the weak, he became as the weak; i. e., preached on the seventh-day Sabbath. But now, to make the matter doubly sure, Paul is asked if he has a "*valid reason*" for doing all this; i. e., for adhering to his *custom* of preaching on the Sabbath. Paul replies, "This I do for the *Gospel's sake*;" i. e., I preach on the Sabbath to Jews, to those that are under the law, to those that are without law, (the Gentiles) and to those that are weak, all for the "*Gospel's sake*," Amen! What stronger reason need we ask for the obligation of the Sabbath in the Gospel dispensation! If Paul has "*driven the nail in a sure place*," Eld. S. has certainly "*clinched it*."

"44. Which ministration is the church under now—the ministration of death, written and engraven in stones, or the ministration of the Spirit? This question is vital to the matter under consideration, and cannot well be overlooked. If the church is under the ministration of the Spirit, then 'he that hath an ear let him hear what the Spirit saith to the churches.' Has the Spirit taught that the Sabbath is the *seal* of the living God, and that all are under obligation to keep it? If so, where has the Spirit or the apostles recorded it?"

I presume that no one doubts that the church is now living under the "ministration of the Spirit,"—the former ministration, or "ministration of death," or condemnation having passed away. See 2 Cor. iii, 7-13. But here it is proper to observe that the apostle informs us, that it is the *ministration* that is "done away," and *not* the ten commandments, or that which is "written and engraven in stones." It is quite common for those of Eld. Seymour's school, to quote the foregoing scripture as proof that the ten commandments, or that which is written and engraven in

stones, is done away. But such "do greatly err." I do not admit, however, that this question of *ministration* is so "*vital* to the matter under consideration," viz., the Sabbath, as Eld. S. seems to regard it. For God's law, I hold, is the same under the present ministration, as under the former ministration; therefore the Sabbath obligation is the same. However, I have an ear to hear, and am willing to "hear what the Spirit saith to the churches." Then, friend S., tell us what saith the Spirit. Does the Spirit say anything against "seventh-day Sabbath keeping?" If so, where? Or, does the Spirit say that the Sabbath is *not* the seal of the living God? You have not informed us where the Spirit says thus; therefore we have no reason, as yet, to conclude that we are not in harmony with the teaching of the Spirit, in saying that the Sabbath is the seal of God. Evidently, there are many Bible facts, that are not in *express language*, taught in the Bible. For instance, it is doubtless a fact that the "fourth beast," in the prophecy of Daniel, symbolizes the Roman kingdom; but the chapter and verse that says so, in plain terms, are wanting. Again, it is no doubt a fact, that the "little horn" spoken of by Daniel, means the Papacy; but where is the record of such fact? The Spirit has not taught it in express language. So in regard to the Sabbath being the seal of the living God. I might say that it is a fact, quite as discoverable as either of the foregoing, though not recorded as such in express terms. For further remarks on this subject, and for proof that the Sabbath is the seal of God, see reply to No. 37.

"45. Where does the church of God, of apostolic times—which was built upon the prophets and apos-

tles, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; which composed the royal priesthood, the holy nation, and peculiar people, and the temple of God, filled with the Holy Ghost enjoyed all the gifts, were the salt of the earth, the luminary of the world, the *pillar* and *ground of the truth*, who went everywhere preaching the kingdom of God, the plan of salvation to dying men—ever enjoin the 4th commandment upon christians?"

The various *changes* that Eld. S. has rung on the foregoing question and preceding ones, indicate clearly enough that he is hard pressed for matter, that affords even the semblance of an objection against the Sabbath. His mind is doubtless fixed on the round number, "*fifty*," as the sum total of his bulwark against "seventh-day Sabbath-keeping." Therefore, for lack of *arguments*, he has only to ring the changes on previous questions to make his number complete.

If Jesus Christ, who is the chief corner stone of the church, and the prophets and apostles who are the foundation of the church, have taught the obligation of the Sabbath, then, certainly it is of no consequence to know whether or not the same has been enjoined by the *church*. And I think I have repeatedly shown that Jesus Christ, the prophets and apostles have plainly and pointedly taught the perpetuity and obligation of the *whole law*, viz., the ten commandments; therefore it is needless to inquire what the church has taught in regard to the fourth commandment. With the *positive* testimony we have on this subject, it is enough to know that the Scriptures contain no instance where the apostolic church ever taught anything against the Sabbath; but so far as their history is known, were ever accustomed to honor the same by a religious observance thereof.

Would not Christians, *even now*, do well to follow apostolic example? Luke xxiii, 56; Acts xiii, 14, 27, 42, 44; xvi, 13; xviii, 4.

"46. Why did Paul, that eminent apostle have such heaviness, and continual sorrow in his heart? Why did he wish himself accursed from Christ? Why did he have such a hearts desire and prayer to God for Israel that they might be saved? Hear his answer, 'For I bear them record, that they have a *zeal of God*, but not according to knowledge.' What was their *zeal*? See Acts xxi, 20.—'Thou seest Bro. how many thousands of Jews there are which believe, and are all *zealous* of the law.'—Acts xxii, 3. Hear the apostle Paul again: 'Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage; behold I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you *nothing*, for I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the *whole law*; Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law *ye are fallen from grace*.' Circumcision is one principle of the law; you may if you please put Sabbath or any other precept in the place of circumcision, and you will get the same pungent answer. The *righteousness* connected with *faith* was what Paul was ardently laboring to establish, and he had a zeal according to knowledge. Rom. x, 1-10."

I readily concede your admission, Eld. S., that Paul had "a zeal according to knowledge." I therefore take pleasure in knowing that we—Seventh-day Adventists—advocate the same kind of righteousness that he labored to establish, viz., "the righteousness connected with *faith*." But whilst it is true that we advocate the righteousness of faith, it is also true that we do not forget that Paul has left on record an emphatic "God forbid" to the doctrine, that the *law* is made void, or abolished in consequence thereof. Rom.

iii, 31. We therefore insist upon obedience to the law as well as obedience to the *faith*. But Eld. S. I desire you to distinctly understand, that we do not claim to be justified by the law; for the law condemns the sinner, rather than justifies him. Hence justification cannot be obtained simply through obedience to the law, for "all have sinned," i. e., transgressed the law, therefore are brought under its condemnation. Justification, then, must be obtained—if obtained at all—through the remedy that is provided, viz., the righteousness, or obedience of *faith*. Rom. iii, 19-31. But such justification, by no means exonerates one from continued obedience to the law.

If a man commit crime against the law of your State; your law does not justify him, but condemns him; and though, henceforth, he may be never so obedient to the law, he still remains under the condemnation thereof. If therefore, he obtain justification, it must be,—not through the law, but through the remedy provided,—perhaps through executive clemency. But would such justification or pardon exonerate the offender from further obedience to the law of Michigan? Would he be at liberty to repeat his crime at his pleasure? Would the law have "ceased its obligation" upon him? I trust such is not the operation of your law in Michigan; nor such according to the wisdom of your law-makers! Neither do I believe that such is according to the wisdom of God, with reference to the Divine law. But you ask, why did Paul "have such heaviness and continual sorrow in his heart?" and "why did he wish himself accursed from Christ?" (Query. Did Paul ever wish himself accursed from Christ? Read the passage again!) Also, why did he have such a

heart's desire that Israel might be saved? And we are informed, rather indirectly however, that it was because they had "a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge." As yet, I fail to discover any argument on your side of the question. If you can show that the zeal of the Jews, that was not according to knowledge, consisted in seventh-day Sabbath-keeping, then you have an argument in your favor, but not otherwise. This, you have not done, and cannot do. You refer us, however, to Acts xxi, 20, to show that such zeal consisted in being "zealous of the law." Now the question is, what law was it that so enlisted the zeal of the Jews, and which was not according to knowledge? Was it the moral, or the ceremonial? If you can show that it was the moral law, or ten commandments, then again you have the argument, but not otherwise. This you are not able to do. The context however, shows plainly that it was the law of Moses, or ceremonial law, of which the Jews were so zealous. Think you, Eld. S., that it would have caused heaviness and sorrow in Paul's heart, to know that his brethren and kinsmen were zealous to keep the precepts of the ten commandments? I think not. Neither do I think that any such zeal, ever caused Paul to wish himself accursed from Christ!!

Now, Eld. S., I propose to take the liberty, since you have granted it, to "put Sabbath, or any other precept in the place of circumcision," in the text which you have quoted. I will first try the Sabbath, and if that reads to suit you, I will try another. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye keep the Sabbath, Christ shall profit you *nothing*(!) for I testify again to every man that keeps the Sabbath, that he is a debtor to

do the *whole law*, i. e., do all that is enjoined in "the five books of Moses," for such is your interpretation of the *whole law*! (See question No. 41.) Let us try the next precept. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye honor your father and your mother, Christ shall profit you *nothing*(!) for I testify again to every man that honors his father and his mother, that he is a debtor to do the whole law, viz., "the five books of Moses." Surely we do get a "*pungent answer!!!*" What extravagant theories men will concoct, simply to get rid of the Sabbath! Such persons, indeed, must have "*a zeal*" to impel them thus; but alas, their zeal is not according to knowledge! Friend S., it is much more difficult to defend *error* than *truth*. The futile efforts which you have put forth in your tract against the Sabbath, clearly show this remark to be true.

"47. Do we make void the law through faith? God forbid, yea, we establish the law, and as Isaiah says, he will magnify and make it honorable.—Rom. iii, 31. Is. xlii, 22. Some positively claim that these passages teach the obligation of the ten commandments. Where is the authority for saying that the law here referred to, is confined to the decalogue? Why will men who claim to be Bible students, assume a thing that is impossible to prove? Let them give us a *thus saith the Lord*, that the *ten precepts* are a *law first*, then we will hear them. The law here referred to is the *law, the whole law of God* given by Moses, and every expression of the apostle relative to the law, will bear me out in what I here affirm. One single consideration is sufficient to demonstrate the signification of the expressions, "Yea we establish the law," "magnify and make it honorable." Luke xxiv, 44. "These are the words I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that *all things* must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses and in the prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me. Now then, I ask in all simplicity, and

godly honesty, were not all the predictions relative to Christ's first advent, *most perfectly accomplished, magnified, established and made honorable*? And is it not even so with all the consecutive chains of prophecy relative to his second advent.

In concluding this tract, I wish to say that I challenge all men, no matter who, or where, whether in Europe or America, to disprove the positions I have here taken."

Really, Eld. S., your challenge is exceedingly broad! But my dear sir, don't flatter yourself that your "positions" are so sound, or that your bulwark against the Sabbath is so strong. For never was a man more deceived than yourself! You have no occasion to go to Europe, nor even to travel far in America, to find many a lad, not yet out of his "teens," who is abundantly able to show that your positions are utterly absurd, and many of them even nonsensical! The position taken in the question now under consideration is plainly one of the latter sort. You require us to give "*a thus saith the Lord*, that the ten precepts are a *law*." Really, I should think you would require a *thus saith the Lord*, to convince you that you have a nose on your face. The latter requirement, in my judgment, would indicate just about as much good sense, as the former. Why sir, if the ten commandments are not a *law*, what are they, I ask? Will you give us a better term? God spake the ten commandments with his own voice, in the presence and hearing of the assembled hosts of Israel, and to them "he added no more." And Moses says further that "he wrote them in two tables of stone and delivered them to me." Deut. v, 22. This language clearly proves that the words which God thus spake and wrote in tables of stone, constitu-

ted *something complete* in itself. Now I ask was it not a law—a moral law—that was thus completed and given to Israel? Webster defines moral law, thus: “a law which prescribes to men their religious and social duties, in other words, their duty to God and to each other.” Do not the ten commandments answer well Webster’s definition of moral law? But, Eld. S., as it happens, we are not without a “thus saith the Lord” on this point. See Ex. xxiv, 12. “And the Lord said unto Moses, come up to me into the mount and be there; and I will give thee tables of stone and a law, and commandments which *I have written*.” Whoever will cavil at such language as this must be willfully blind.

At the commencement of your question you refer us to Rom. iii, 31, and Isaiah xlii, 21, and assert that the law there spoken of, is the “whole law of God given by Moses.” In this connection I wish to propose a question, as an answer to one of yours, and will leave it with the reader to judge which involves the greatest offence. You ask, “Why will men who claim to be Bible students, assume a thing which is impossible to prove?” I ask, why will men who make the additional claim of “*godly honesty*,” assert a thing so plainly contrary to reason and fact, as to say that the law referred to in the foregoing texts, is the “whole law of God given by Moses;” or as you elsewhere claim—“the five books of Moses?” But for argument’s sake, admit that you are correct; then according to Paul, this *whole law*, whatever it may be, is not made void, is not abolished, is not destroyed, is not done away, is not come to naught, is not vanished away; (for the original word *katargeo* has these various render-

ings,) but on the contrary is *established*. The word *establish* is defined by Webster, thus: “To set and fix firmly and unalterably; to settle permanently; to make firm; to confirm; to ratify,” &c. Now as the Sabbath is embraced in your *whole law* as you admit, the text referred to, proves in the strongest language possible, that it is not abolished or done away, but fixed “firmly and unalterably,” &c. Therefore we have no issue on this point. But if you thus establish the *whole law of Moses*, I have only to say that that is your matter, not mine. I wish to enter my protest however against such an absurdity. But one word about magnifying the law and making it honorable. It is folly to suppose that the language of the prophet—Isaiah xlii, 21—related to the fulfilling of what was written in the law of Moses concerning Christ; or to suppose that Christ came into the world to magnify and make honorable the law of Moses! He had a different object than this in view. It was to magnify and make honorable his Father’s law, which man had dishonored by transgression. It was to demonstrate the great problem,—how God can be just and yet the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus. Rom. iii, 26. Through the atonement of Christ, which was typified in the law of Moses, this great problem was solved; and the law of God—the ten commandments—which otherwise must have remained in dishonor in consequence of man’s transgression, was magnified and made honorable. Then in regard to the question, which, truly enough, you ask in “*simplicity*,” and which you profess to ask in “*godly honesty*,” I have to say, that “the predictions relative to Christ’s first advent,” “which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets and in the Psalms,” were truly “*most perfectly accomplished*—

ed;" and that by virtue of such perfect accomplishment, the law of God, which man had transgressed, was "*magnified, established and made honorable.*"

"48. Are all *Sabbaths* (seventh-day not excepted) *shadows*? This is a very important consideration; for if all *Sabbaths* are shadows and our Lord Jesus Christ the substance of them all; then all *Sabbaths* of a former dispensation *ceased* their binding force when the *substance* came, for shadows never reach beyond their substance. Some acknowledge willingly, that all except the seventh-day *Sabbath* are shadows; but are unwilling to admit the seventh to be such. But I ask, will not the *same thing* that makes one *Sabbath* a shadow, make all the rest the same: cause and effect are inseparable. Now what is it that makes *all Sabbaths* under the law *shadows*? The days in and of themselves independent of anything that transpired upon them, *cast no shadows*; but upon *each* of these *Sabbaths*, seventh-day not excepted, *sacrifices* were offered, and all these sacrifices were *typical* of the coming of the one great sacrifice, even Jesus Christ our great high priest. Paul an apostle, wise in the wisdom of God, when speaking of *Sabbaths*, says, they are a *shadow* of things to come, but the body is of Christ." Does he except the seventh-day? No, no. Would he not have done so had he known that God purposed that the church in this age was duly bound to observe it; let the wise answer. God is the author of *all Sabbaths*; *all* are blessed sanctified, and made holy; *all* are shadows, and reach to the substance, Christ, and then terminate.—Num. xxviii, 9, 10. Ezek. xlv, 17; xlv, 1-4. Col. ii, 16, 17.

"Ye do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures." The seventh-day *Sabbath* is *not a shadow*. This is clearly evident from the fact that it was introduced before *sin* entered into the world, and therefore before types and shadows were instituted, or became necessary. It is the height of folly to suppose that types and

shadows of our Lord Jesus Christ, were introduced into the world to indicate redemption, before man had sinned, and needed to be redeemed. This consideration alone is proof positive that the seventh-day *Sabbath* is not a shadow, of which our Lord Jesus Christ is the substance.

But let us look at your reasoning. You claim that the *same thing* that makes one *Sabbath* a shadow, will make all other *Sabbaths* shadows; and you cite us to the fact that *sacrifices* were made on all the *Sabbaths*, seventh-day not excepted, as the reason of their being shadows. Your reasoning here, as usual, is very defective. Your language implies that the act of appointing certain days as *Sabbaths*, and making them *shadows*, are separate and distinct transactions; or in other words, that certain days were first made *Sabbaths*, and afterwards made *shadows*, by virtue of the sacrifices that were made thereon! To me, it seems much more reasonable, and more in accordance with Bible truth, to conclude that the annual *Sabbaths* of the Jews received their shadowy significance from the circumstances or events that gave rise to their appointment. Take for instance the two annual *Sabbaths* that were connected with the paschal feast, which occurred on the fifteenth and twenty-first days of the first month. That which gave rise to these *Sabbaths*, and which gave them their shadowy significance, was the slaying of the paschal lamb, the Lord's passover and deliverance of the Hebrews from Egyptian bondage; a fit type indeed of Christ—the great passover that was slain for us; and of the great deliverance that he will eventually effect for his people. But think you, that the "*same thing*," viz: the slaying of the paschal lamb,

&c., which made the Sabbaths of the *first month* shadows, also made shadows of the four annual Sabbaths that occurred in the *seventh month*! or what is still more preposterous, a shadow of the weekly Sabbath of the Lord, that was instituted as a memorial of his rest from creation. Do you not see the absurdity of your reasoning? It is true that the Jews were required to offer sacrifices on the seventh-day Sabbath, as well as on their annual Sabbaths; so were they also required to offer sacrifices *daily*, and especially upon each successive day during their paschal feast, and feast of tabernacles, with which certain of their Sabbaths were identified. Num. xxviii, 24; xxix 12-40. And these *daily* sacrifices were also typical of Christ, as well as those that were made on the various Sabbaths. Therefore if your reasoning is good, to wit: that these sacrifices are what made the various Sabbaths, types and shadows of Christ, they would also have made *every day* a type and shadow of Christ! "Consistency, thou art a jewel!"

In regard to what Paul says in Col. ii, 16, 17, to which you have referred, it is enough to say that he there speaks,—not of the weekly Sabbath of the Lord, (singular,) but of the "Sabbath days" (plural,) that were connected with meats and drinks, new moons, &c., which were the annual Sabbaths of the Jews, of which we have been speaking.

"49. What constitutes the *Royal Law* spoken of by James? Some would have us believe that the decalogue is that law. But this cannot be; for that which requires neither love to God or your neighbor cannot be considered Royal. Webster in defining *royal*, gives the following significations, king-like, princely, august, majestic, superb, splendid, illustrious, noble, magnanimous. This signification perfectly corres-

ponds with the *two great commandments*, to love God with all the heart and to love your neighbor as yourself. Mark xii, 29, 30. These are truly *royal*, and upon these *two* commandments hang all the law and the prophets. Any one who will bestow a little thought upon the second chap. of James, the first nine verses, will never conclude that the *ten precepts* are the royal law. This *royal law* never was written upon the two tables of stone."

Such statements as the foregoing are altogether too unwarrantable to be received as truth, simply on your assertion. And your *twice repeated* sentiment, that the ten commandments neither require love to God nor man, is too much of an outrage on common sense, as well as being too directly opposed to God's word, to be received as proof that they do not constitute the *royal law* spoken of by James. I am certainly amazed, that any man claiming to be a minister of the Gospel, and withal, professing "*godly honesty*," should be guilty of uttering such an untruthful and God-dishonoring sentiment! The apostle Paul differs widely from you on this point. He enjoins us to love one another, and says, "For he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law." Rom. xiii, 8. Also in the 10th verse he says, "Love is the fulfilling of the law." Therefore if loving one another is the *fulfilling of the law*, of course the law requires such love. And here Paul has not left us in doubt as to what law he referred to; for in the 9th verse,—immediately between the two positive expressions above noticed,—he clearly and unmistakably identifies the code of ten commandments, as the law of which he was speaking, by quoting five precepts from the second table thereof—that which relates to our duty to each other, and which was the subject of his remarks. Then his manner of reference to the second

great commandment of Christ, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," and the immediate connection it bears to the precepts he had just quoted, proves that it is a comprehensive term, or summary of the second table of the decalogue; as likewise the first great commandment, to love the Lord thy God, &c., is a summary of the first table. Thus, Paul's reasoning is in harmony with the statement of Christ, that "On these two commandments hang *all* the law and the prophets." But since you deny that the ten commandments constitute the law to which our Saviour referred, I ask you to inform us what law it was that hung on those two fundamental principles of love to God, and love to man, at the time our Saviour informed his questioner of the fact? It will not do for you to say the whole law, or five books of Moses, as you term it, for the ten commandments are embraced therein, and you deny that they require any such love. Truly, "God's holy word meets you at every *turn* and *twist* unsheathed, and cuts your theory on every side." Such is the select language you saw fit to apply to us, (see question No. 42) but does it not apply with ten-fold more force to yourself? "Judge ye." But Eld. S., you will allow me to say that your sense of discrimination must be very acute indeed, to enable you to designate the two commandments above named, as the *royal law*, to the exclusion of the ten commandments; whereas, the former are but a brief summary of the latter. Again, you show a remarkable power of discrimination in being able to discern that Webster's definition of *royal*, so much more "perfectly corresponds" with the two commandments aforesaid, than it does with the ten commandments.

God is pre-eminently the author of the ten command-

ments, for he spoke them with his own voice, and wrote them with his own finger on tables of stone. Look again, Eld. S., if you please, at the signification of the term *royal*, and then say if you dare, that the title of *royal* is not applicable, yea, pre-eminently applicable to the ten commandments, which were thus spoken and written by the great King of kings, the maker and preserver of the universe.

In conclusion, I have to say that I have bestowed thought—according to your request—on the first nine verses of the second chap. of James, and also on the following verses; and I am thereby still constrained to believe that the ten commandments are not only a royal law, but *the* royal law spoken of by James, your assertion to the contrary notwithstanding. You should have learned ere this, that it is one thing to make an assertion, but quite a different matter to prove it!

"50. Where is there any evidence that the *covenant commanded* (See 1 Chron. xvi, 15-18. Ps. cv, 8-12. Gen. xvii, 1-3. Acts vii, 8. Rom. iv, 11, 12,) to a thousand generations, is the *covenant* of ten commandments? Let the un-visioned, un-prejudiced, un-sectarianised, un-creedised, humble student of the precious word of life, determine the truthfulness of this enquiry, by comprehending the above references to Scripture facts. It will not do for men to assert and re-assert without giving proof to substantiate what they affirm. The thing must be proved by plain, incontrovertible facts. Now the above testimony will convince all men who are *wedded to truth* more than to party, that the covenant commanded to a thousand generations, is the covenant of circumcision. But for the arguments sake, I am willing to admit that it is the covenant of ten commandments. Now then, it is claimed by Sabbath keepers, that there has been only about 100 generations since creation, consequently,

the decalogue must be observed 900 generations yet, and they all this while believing that all generation is soon to cease by the coming of Christ. Oh, consistency thou art a precious jewel! Let me carry this thought a little farther, for the benefit of those who already think that they are invulnerable, infallible, and diplomised in reference to the Sabbath. Are not all the commandments, statutes, judgments, even the entire law commanded to a thousand generations? Yes, or in other words throughout their generations, for the last expression signifies the whole of their generations. Consult the following testimony, and all the candid will surely say yes. Deut. vii, 9, 11; viii, 1, 11; x, 12, 13; xi, 1, 8, 22, 32. Lev. xxiii, 14, 21, 31. Eph. ii, 15. Col. ii, 14-17. Rom. x, 4. Gal. v, 4, 8, 9."

I heartily subscribe to one sentiment contained in the foregoing, namely: "It will not do for men to assert and re-assert without giving proof to substantiate what they affirm." And one prominent assertion made therein, forcibly impresses my mind with the importance of giving special heed to the truthful remark above expressed. Had the author of "fifty unanswerable arguments" faithfully heeded the same, his tract had been beautifully less than what it is now; and surely there had been no place therein for any such wild assertion as that to which I allude, viz., "that the covenant commanded to a thousand generations is the covenant of circumcision." And you, Eld. S., have the effrontery to say, substantially, that the *testimony* which you have produced "will convince all men who are wedded to truth," that the above is the true doctrine. To this remark I will simply say, that no one who is *wedded to common sense*, and is not "*unvisioned*," (i. e., blind,) will ever be convinced of any such thing. But let us examine carefully the "testi-

mony." Your first three references, 1 Chron. xvi, 15-18. Ps. cv, 8-12. Gen. xvii, 1-3, all speak plainly of God's covenant made with Abraham; but not one word therein is said, nor allusion therein made, to "the covenant of circumcision," and from the first two references aforesaid, we learn that God had commanded his covenant with Abraham, to a thousand generations. Surely then, your "testimony" thus far, proves nothing for you. In your next reference, Acts vii, 8, an incidental allusion is made to God's act of giving to Abraham the rite of circumcision, which, indeed, is here called the covenant of circumcision; but not one word is said about this covenant being commanded to a thousand generations. And it is also worthy of remark that this covenant of circumcision is not said to have been made with Abraham, but *given* to him. See reference: "He gave him the covenant of circumcision;" and this is in harmony with what Paul says of the same matter in Rom. iv, 11, which is your next and last reference: "He, (Abraham) *received* the *sign* of circumcision," &c. From one of these texts we learn that God gave to Abraham the covenant or sign of circumcision, and from the other that Abraham received it; also that the word *covenant* in the former text, is used in an accommodated sense, and corresponds exactly with the word *sign* in the latter text. But now it is proper to inquire, of what was the rite of circumcision a *sign*? The answer to this question furnishes the key to the whole matter. By turning to the 17th chap. of Genesis, which gives the original account of the matter under consideration, we find the answer, We there learn that the rite of circumcision which was given to Abraham, was a *sign* or *token* of the covenant

made with him. See Gen. xvii, 11, "And it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you." Then, indeed, if circumcision is the token or sign of the covenant which God made with Abraham, it cannot be the covenant itself. Therefore, your "testimony" totally fails to prove what you affirm.

We are now prepared to consider the covenant which God made with Abraham, and which was commanded to a thousand generations. God's covenant, strictly speaking, consisted only of what he had commanded; but in what is termed the Abrahamic covenant, there were mutual considerations existing, there being embraced therein God's *promise* to Abraham and his seed, of the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession. Gen. xvii, 8. 1 Chron. xvi, 18. Ps. cv, 11. The faithful performance of God's covenant proper, being the basis or consideration of his promise of the land of Canaan. This view looks reasonable and is in perfect harmony with the reason which God assigned for renewing his covenant with Isaac, "Because that Abraham obeyed my voice and kept my charge, my commandments my statutes and my laws." Gen. xxvi, 5. But we notice that God's covenant which was commanded to a thousand generations, was also confirmed unto Jacob for a *law*, and to Israel for an *everlasting covenant*. This law and this everlasting covenant we will now proceed to identify, which being done, will of course identify the covenant commanded to a thousand generations.

We pass along down through the patriarchal dispensation, from Abraham to Isaac, thence to Jacob and his descendants, and then on a noted occasion we hear the Lord saying to Moses, "Come up to me in the mount and be there, and I will give thee tables of stone and a law and commandments which I have written."

Ex. xxiv, 12. Here we find the law of ten commandments about to be confirmed unto Jacob, (his descendants.) Afterwards we hear Moses speaking unto Israel, thus: "And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire; ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude, only ye heard a voice. And he declared unto you his covenant which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments, and he wrote them upon two tables of stone." Deut. iv, 12, 13. Here we discover that the same law of ten commandments which the Lord promised to give Moses in the mount, is identified as God's covenant, is a covenant commanded. Again we hear Moses saying to Israel, "But because the Lord loved you, and because he would keep the oath which he had sworn unto your fathers, . . . know therefore, that the Lord thy God, he is God, the faithful God, which keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love him, and keep his commandments to a thousand generations. Deut. vii, 8, 9. Here is a plain reference to God's covenant with Abraham, and from this text, it is clear that God's commandments here spoken of, are identical with the covenant that was commanded to a thousand generations. Therefore from the various texts which I have quoted and referred to, I cannot possibly avoid the conclusion, that the ten commandments constitute the covenant commanded to a thousand generations.

But Eld. S., for "arguments sake," you very graciously admit my conclusion. But alas for such arguments! It is claimed, forsooth, "by Sabbath-keepers that there has been only about 100 generations since creation, (I am not aware that any such claim is peculiar among Sabbath-keepers,) consequently the dec-

alogue must be observed 900 generations yet, and they all the while believing that all generation is soon to cease by the coming of Christ!" Did it occur to Eld. S., before he admitted so much for "arguments sake," that he also was an advent believer, and that he professes to believe "that all generation is soon to cease by the coming of Christ!" What would he propose to have done with his covenant of circumcision (which he says is commanded to a thousand generations) during the 900, or unexpired generations yet to come! If we are in a dilemma, is he not in a worse one? But I am pleased to inform our friend that under the new covenant, God's law is to be written in the hearts of his people; and consequently it will be their pleasure to observe the same, not only during the comparatively short period represented by 900 generations yet to come, but still onward thence through the rolling ages of eternity, *ad infinitum*. Think not that, although "all generation" is to cease by the coming of Christ, that therefore a given period of duration,—which perchance may be represented by a certain number of generations,—must also of necessity cease at the same time! I have no doubt that every child of God, when gathered home into his kingdom, will be inspired by a sentiment akin to that which inspired the heart of David, when he said, "I delight to do thy will O my God; yea thy law is within my heart."

But right here, Eld. S., you seem to have a prolific "thought," and desire to carry the same "a little farther," for the benefit of those who are "*diplomised*," &c., with reference to the Sabbath. Now as I am not familiar with the meaning of the word *diplomised*, I presume I am not fully prepared to appreciate the

force of your "thought!" Doubtless you are able to define the term, though I think Webster says nothing about it. The product of your *thought*, however, seems to be, that all the commandments, statutes, and judgments, and even the entire law, are commanded to a thousand generations, or in other words, as you say, "throughout their generations;" thus making the expression, "throughout their generations," synonymous with "a thousand generations." Though your *thought* results in such a statement, and though you have appended thereto several Scripture references as vouchers for the same, I have to say that the *proof* is still wanting. Your texts utterly fail to furnish the key to your conclusion; and I know of no rule by which we are to determine that a *thousand* means any less than *ten hundred*. Thus I leave your fiftieth and last "unanswerable argument" against the Sabbath; and now present to the reader your closing remarks.

"These important questions and remarks are submitted to the candid consideration of all our brethren everywhere, and especially to that class who observe the fourth commandment. My prayer and *earnest* exhortation to all of our brethren in the ministry, as well as the lay members of the church is to *thoroughly canvass* the Sabbath question; for when you shall have done this, you will have learnt to your entire satisfaction, that there is not one *particle* of *evidence* shining from God's precious word, which impresses seventh-day Sabbath-keeping upon *christians*. Some of our brethren are fully posted upon this question, but many are not. Those that are, their *whole being* rests in the assurance that they are right in the matter, and fear not to meet the issue any where, nor with any person. Dear brethren, you who have this *great truth* burning upon the altar of your hearts, *do not neglect* to carry this *present truth* among the Sab-

bath congregations everywhere! Go to head quarters, to Battle Creek, and implore them in the name of Jesus Christ and the holy apostles, to open their doors, their church, the columns of their paper, and their hearts, for the reception of the *truth*. They have had a *great zeal*, a *zeal* too, that is not according to knowledge, for our conversion. Now then, let us return the favor with a *zeal* and *power* that is according to knowledge. They will, and must feel the force of facts, and every honest soul must forsake that sandy foundation, or be *lost eternally*. Some may suppose that this cutting remark is very uncharitable; but when I take into consideration the *testimony* of God's word, and the *spirit* which it inculcates in its adherents, the conclusion is unavoidable. These are my honest conclusions, after years of faithful investigation.

Comments on the above remarks are unnecessary. I have only to say, that it is a matter of deep regret, that any man, whom God has endowed with an ordinary intellectual capacity, should, "after years of faithful investigation," be led to adopt as his "honest conclusions," such views and sentiments as are put forth with so much assurance by Mr. Seymour in his tract. As for myself, I am not yet prepared to believe that God's moral law of ten commandments is such a "sandy foundation" as that "every honest soul must forsake" it, or be "*lost eternally*!" Neither am I prepared to believe that there is danger of being "*lost eternally*" on account of a strict and holy observance of the Lord's Sabbath. Although my "years of faithful investigation" of the matter in controversy, may have been considerably less than Eld. Seymour's, yet, I am thankful that during a comparatively *short period* of such investigation, I have been able to see and learn the falsity of the doctrine, that God's moral law has "ceased its obligations upon the world!" I am thank-

ful also for the light of "present truth" in regard to the Sabbath; that, although the dust and tradition of centuries have been thrown around it by the "man of sin," God in his providence has caused and is causing light from the heavenly sanctuary to shine thereupon.

Reader, I have finished my task. I have written much more than I intended when I commenced, yet have endeavored to be brief. And though I have presented scarcely a tithe of the evidence at hand, in favor of the perpetuity of the Lord's Sabbath, yet I trust I have not failed to show clearly to all,—except those who are determined to doubt and cavil,—that there is no soundness whatever in the so called "fifty unanswerable arguments against Seventh-day Sabbath-keeping."

May the Lord lead us, dear reader, into all truth, and help us to be obedient unto all his commandments, that we "may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."



PUBLICATIONS.

The law requires the pre-payment of postage on all transient publications, at the rates of one cent an ounce for Books and Pamphlets, and one-half cent an ounce for Tracts, in packages of eight ounces or more. Those who order Pamphlets and Tracts to be sent by mail, will please send enough to pre-pay postage. Orders, to secure attention, must be accompanied with the cash. Address ELDER JAMES WHITE, Battle Creek, Michigan.

	Price.	Postage.
	cts.	cts.
History of the Sabbath , (in paper covers), . . .	30	10
The Three Angels of Rev. xiv, 6-12, particularly the Third Angel's Message, and the Two-horned Beast, .	15	4
Sabbath Tracts , numbers one, two, three, and four, .	15	4
Hope of the Gospel , or Immortality the gift of God, .	15	4
Which? Mortal or Immortal? or an inquiry into the present constitution and future condition of man, .	15	4
Modern Spiritualism ; its Nature and Tendency, .	15	4
The Kingdom of God ; a Refutation of the doctrine called, Age to Come,	15	4
Miraculous Powers ,	15	4
Pauline Theology , or the Christian Doctrine of Future Punishment as taught in the epistles of Paul, . . .	15	4
Review of Seymour . His Fifty Questions Answered, .	10	3
Prophecy of Daniel : The Four Universal Kingdoms the Sanctuary and Twenty-three Hundred Days, . .	10	3
The Saints' Inheritance . The Immortal Kingdom located on the New Earth,	10	3
Signs of the Times , showing that the Second Coming of Christ is at the door,	10	3
Law of God . The testimony of both Testaments, showing its origin and perpetuity,	10	3
Vindication of the true Sabbath, by J. W. Morton, late Missionary to Hayti,	10	3
Review of Springer on the Sabbath, Law of God, and first day of the week,	10	3
Facts for the Times . Extracts from the writings of eminent authors, Ancient and Modern,	10	3
Miscellany . Seven Tracts in one book on the Second Advent and the Sabbath,	10	3

PUBLICATIONS.

Christian Baptism . Its Nature, Subjects, and Design, .	10	3
The Seven Trumpets . The Soundings of the seven Trumpets of Revelation viii and ix,	10	2
The Fate of the Transgressor , or a short argument on the First and Second Deaths,	5	2
Matthew xxiv . A Brief Exposition of the Chapter, .	5	2
Assistant . The Bible Student's Assistant, or a Compend of Scripture references,	5	1
Truth Found . A short argument for the Sabbath, with an Appendix, "The Sabbath not a Type," . . .	5	1
The Two Laws and Two Covenants ,	5	1
An Appeal for the restoration of the Bible Sabbath in an address to the Baptists,	5	1
Review of Crozier on the Institution, Design, and Abolition of the Seventh-day Sabbath,	5	1
Review of Fillio . A reply to a series of discourses delivered by him in Battle Creek on the Sabbath question, .	5	1
Brown's Experience . Consecration--Second Advent, .	5	1
Report of General Conference held in Battle Creek, June, 1859, Address on Systematic Benevolence, &c., .	5	1
Sabbath Poem . False Theories Exposed,	5	1
Illustrated Review . A Double Number of the REVIEW AND HERALD Illustrated,	5	1
Nature and Obligation of the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment Apostasy and perils of the last days, .	5	1
The same in German,	5	1
" " Holland,	5	1
French . A Pamphlet on the Sabbath,	5	1
" " " Dan. ii, and vii,	5	1
ONE CENT TRACTS . Who Changed the Sabbath? Unity of the Church Spiritual Gifts Law of God, by Wesley Appeal for men of reason on Immortality--Much in Little--Truth--Death and Burial--Preach the Word--Personality of God.		
TWO CENT TRACTS . Dohney on the Law Infidelity and Spiritualism--Mark of the Beast.		

Bound Books.

The figures set to the following Bound Books include both the price of the Book and the postage,
The Hymn Book, containing 464 pages and 122 pieces of music. 80 cts.

PUBLICATIONS.

- History of the Sabbath**, in one volume, bound
 Part I, Bible History Part II, Secular History, . . . 60 "
Spiritual Gifts Vol. I, or the Great Controversy between Christ and his angels, and Satan and his angels, . 50 "
Spiritual Gifts Vol. II. Experience, Views and Incidents in connection with the Third Message, . . . 50 "
Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment. By H. H. Dobney, Baptist Minister of England, . . . 75 "
Home Here and Home in Heaven, with other Poems. This work embraces all those sweet and Scriptural poems written by Annie R. Smith, from the time she embraced the third message till she fell asleep in Jesus. Price 25 cents.
The Chart. A Pictorial Illustration of the Visions of Daniel and John, 20 by 25 inches. Price 15 cents. On rollers, post-paid, 75 cts.

The Advent Review and Sabbath Herald

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, BY

The Seventh-Day Adventist Publishing Association.

TERMS.—Two Dollars a year in advance. One Dollar to the poor and to those who subscribe one year on trial. Free to those unable to pay half price.

Address ELDER JAMES WHITE, Battle Creek, Michigan.

THE YOUTH'S INSTRUCTOR

IS PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE

Seventh-day Adventist Publishing Association.

TERMS IN ADVANCE.

Single copy, 25 cts.
 From 10 to 20 copies directed to one person, 20 cts.
 From 20 to 100 copies directed to one person, 15 cts.
 Those unable to pay, Free.
 No subscription received for less than one year.
 Address Eld. JAMES WHITE, Battle Creek, Mich.

